

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Vol. XI.

No. 2

Chairman, Editorial Board: HIS GRACE THE
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor: Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor: The Very Rev. J. M. T.
BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.

FEB.

1936

THE FUTURE OF ANGLICANISM. By DEREK HARBORD, Barrister-at-Law.

THE VICISSITUDES OF FREQUENT COMMUNION (Second Article—Conclusion). By the Rev. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

PURITANISM AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY. By ARNOLD LUNN.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST IN THE TEACHING OF ST. JOHN EUDES. By the Rev. HERBERT H. J. CREES.

For other Features and Full Contents, see page iv.

THE UNIVERSE

184, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

BURNS OATES

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

**PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS
GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE**

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,
and Belles Lettres*

THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR
**CHURCH FURNITURE
CARVED WOOD-WORK
BRASS & SILVER WARE
STATUES & PICTURES**

DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION

Catalogues, post free, to any address

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.

BURNS OATES

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

**PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS
GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE**

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,
and Belles Lettres*

**THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR
CHURCH FURNITURE
CARVED WOOD-WORK
BRASS & SILVER WARE
STATUES & PICTURES**

**DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION**

Catalogues, post free, to any address

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor :
THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor :
THE VERY REV. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.Ser.

VOLUME XI, No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1936.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)
184, Strand, London, W.C.2

THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ
CATHOLIC PAPER

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

The clergy will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

The clergy will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

¶ Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

184, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

CRITIQUE TEXTUELLE II, LA CRITIQUE RATIONNELLE, by Le P. M.-J. Lagrange, O.P. (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre. 685 pp.)

THE SECRET OF SAINT JOHN BOSCO, by Henri Ghéon, translated by F. J. Sheed. (Sheed & Ward. 203 pp. 6s.)

L'ENFANT DEVANT LE VIE, by L'Abbe Viollet. (Bernard Grasset. 203 pp. 10 fr.)

ALPHA ET OMEGA, De Deo Uno et Trino, Creante et Elevante, et de novissimis, by Joannes Moran, S.J., S.T.D. (Harrigan Press, Mass. 179 pp. \$2.00.)

IN QUEST OF BEAUTY, by Dom Willibrord Verkade, O.S.B. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Son. 292 pp. \$2.00.)

A MODERN PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, by A Fellow Pilgrim. (The Alden Press. 460 pp. 7s. 6d.)

REPERTOIRE PRATIQUE DE DROIT CIVIL ET ECCLESIASTIQUE, by un groupe de professeurs et de jurisconsultes, Vols. I and II. (Paris: La Bonne Presse. 15 frs.)

ACTES DE S.S. PIE XI, Vols. III, IV, V and VI. (Paris: La Bonne Presse.)

SAINT BONIFACE, by Godfrey Kurth, Translated by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Day. (London: G. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd. 178 pp. 8s. 6d.)

GOLDEN HOURS BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, by Rev. Fr. Laurence, O.D.C. (Dublin: Mahon's Printing Works. 170 pp. 1s.)

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO, 1936. (Published by Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 5s. net.)

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, 1936. (Published by Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 3s. 6d.)

TRACTATUS DE RUBRICIS MISSALIS ROMANI, by Aug. Croegaert. (Mechliniae: H. Dessain. 249 pp.)

CAEREMONIALE, Pars Prior: de Ministris, by J. F. Van Der Stappen and Aug. Croegaert. (Mechliniae: H. Dessain. 400 pp.)

CAEREMONIALE, Pars Altera: de Celebrante, by J. F. Van Der Stappen and Aug. Croegaert. (Mechliniae: H. Dessain. 423 pp.)

EPITRES DE SAINT JEAN, by le P. Joseph Bensirven, S.J. (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne. 307 pp. 24 frs.)

THE GLORIOUS BONDAGE OF ILLNESS, by France Pastorelli, Translated by A.D. (George Allen & Unwin. 224 pp. 6s.)

HISTOIRE DE L'EGLISE, Tome 2, De La fin du 2e siecle a la paix constantinienne, by Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiller. (Bloud & Gay. 511 pp. 60 fr.)

LE PRETRE FRANCAIS ET LA SOCIETE CONTEMPORAINE, by l'Abbe J. Brugerette, Tome II, Vers La Separation. (P. Lethielleux. 636 pp. 45 fr.)

THE NEW PSALTER, Latin and English, Edited by Rev. E. P. Graham, LL.D. (Frederick Pustet Company, Inc. \$2.50.)

LAWS OF LIFE, by Halliday Sutherland. (Sheed & Ward. 281 pp. 6s.)

JOURNEY TO ROME, by Father Martin Dempsey. (Alexander Ouseley, Ltd. 232 pp. 3s. 6d.)

CONTENTS

FEBRUARY, 1936

ARTICLES :—	PAGE
1. The Future of Anglicanism, By DEREK HARBORD, Barrister-at-Law	85
2. The Vicissitudes of Frequent Communion (Second Article— Conclusion), By the Rev. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.	101
3. Puritanism and the New Psychology, By ARNOLD LUNN	110
4. The Kingdom of Christ in the Teaching of St. John Eudes, By the Rev. HERBERT H. J. CREES	116
HOMILETICS :—	
By the Right Rev. MGR. DEAN, D.D., Ph.D.	130
NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—	
I. Holy Scripture, By the Very Rev. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Scr.	142
II. Moral Theology and Canon Law, By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	147
III. Pastoral Theology, By the Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.	151
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :—	
(1) Mass Vestments	155
(2) Mass Bell	156
(3) Missa Paroecialis	156
(4) Mental Recitation of Prayer	159
By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	
ROMAN DOCUMENTS	160
BOOK REVIEWS	163
REVIEWS FROM ABROAD	167
THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD :—	
I. King George V	170
II. France, By DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt.	170
III. Central Europe, By C. F. MELVILLE	173
CORRESPONDENCE	176

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE FUTURE OF ANGLICANISM

BY DEREK HARBORD, Barrister-at-Law.

ALMOST one needs to have been an Anglican to realize how lightly the shackles of establishment are borne by the Church of England. To an outsider the idea of being under the control of Parliament in things spiritual is monstrous and indeed intolerable. Yet the system works to-day with sufficient smoothness, and to the general satisfaction of that inert mass of central churchmen—non-party men—who form the body of Anglicanism.

After all, Parliament does not actively interfere. Prime Ministers consult the Bishops before filling vacant sees. The fulminations and sword of the Judicial Bench are not now invoked for the discipline of the High or Low Churchman who is more enthusiastic than law-abiding. No one is expected to pay any attention to Privy Council Judgments on doctrine or ritual. Politicians are rarely found to rush in where Bishops fear to tread.

In the parishes the Establishment leaves every Vicar free in practice to teach what doctrine he chooses and to use what ceremonial seems right to him. Could the most ardent champion of liberty desire more, or the most successful achieve it? If in the incidents of Anglican ordination one must give general assent to Articles wherein "sacrifices of Masses" are termed "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," at least one is free to announce to the public one's intention of offering such sacrifices from day to day in one's church. If in past days Anglicans have roundly declared that the Pope is Anti-Christ, at least their successors to-day are free to teach that one must acknowledge the Holy Father as Head of the Church (so long as one does not hold him competent to decide that one's Orders are invalid), and

that one should work and pray for the day of general submission to him. That your brother-vicar in the next parish denounces your teaching as mediæval superstition merely shows that establishment does not cramp the style so much as add that quality which is said to be the spice of life, and which is certainly the spice of Anglicanism.

For those to whom mention of Anglicanism suggests nothing more than love of compromise, it is difficult to see why not all Anglicans are content to rejoice, like the saints in their beds, over the *fait accompli* of a Church which, created and endowed precisely in order that it should be subservient to the State, has silently repudiated that subjugation and yet succeeded in retaining the endowments which were the original price of submission. After four hundred years, say the critics, Anglicans have gained the substance of freedom, less by skilful campaigning than by the haphazard fumbings of Blind Man's Buff. But now, they complain, these indiscreet people must needs wave banners, emit angry cries, focus attention on their capture of that dangerous substance, generally turn the world upside down and risk the loss of everything, all merely in order to capture the shadow, too. The State must not merely be beaten, but must acknowledge itself to be beaten. Ecclesiastical statesmanship seems to have died with Randall Davidson.

However unfair such criticisms, it is true that for five years an Archbishops' Commission of leading Anglicans has been at work to discover how their Church may ease itself still further of the bonds of State control. Meetings of that Commission were completed some time since, and the Report is already overdue. It was to be issued the year before last. It was confidently expected last year. Now it is announced for early this year. With the safe return of the present Parliamentary majority, all need for further delay has gone.

If, as many clergy hope and expect, the Commission recommends Disestablishment and finds its advice accepted by the Anglican Church, the State is unlikely to grant the demand without a substantial measure of Disendowment as well. The two went together in Ireland in 1869, and in 1919 they went together in Wales, where what the Archbishop of Wales has described as "wholesale confiscation and certain tardy deeds of

restitution " resulted in the loss of about seven-eighth's of that Church's income.

The Anglican demand for something like Disestablishment, long mooted in the vague way that men talk of the abolition of capital punishment, became an urgent matter of conviction for many upon the House of Commons rejection of the Revised Prayer Book in 1927 and again in 1928. Though Anglicans have now forgotten the strong resentment felt over the rejections, it was that resentment which was responsible for the appointment of the Commission. It is therefore germane to recall briefly the history of that ill-fated book.

The State, disturbed at the Bishops' failure throughout half a century (and at the failure of its own special effort in 1874) to administer existing law, ritual law, tentatively acquiesced in the view of a Royal Commission of 1904-6 that "the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation." Accordingly, the State instructed the Church of England to make proposals for an amendment of the law to something which could be enforced, and after twenty years' work on the part of the best brains in Anglicanism the Revised Prayer Book was submitted to Parliament as a response to that demand. It was conceived as a rod for the backs of the extremists.

With an impressive unanimity, countless representative and official bodies of Anglican clergy and laity throughout the length and breadth of England had approved it by overwhelming majorities. If ever a Prayer Book could claim general Church approval, the effort of 1927 could do so. The Book had subsequently been to the Lords, who passed it by a large majority. But the stiffest fence remained.

The House of Commons formed the opinion that the doctrine of that Book was different from the Protestant doctrine authorized by the State for the Anglican Church in the existing Prayer Book, and found the change unacceptable. Further, the House did not believe that the Revised Book's proposals would be effective in restoring discipline within the Anglican Church. (The extreme section of the High Church Party had already announced that they would not obey the new Book even if it were passed. So saying, they joined their voices in an unaccustomed harmony with those of the extreme

section of the Low Church Party, who intimated that they found the Book equally objectionable.) The Commons therefore rejected the Revised Book in 1927, and the re-Revised Book in 1928.

These rejections by the Commons stimulated the late Dr. Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, to a prompt and dignified pronouncement in the name of a unanimous Episcopate. At the consideration of the Book by the House of Lords he had said: "Every member of this House has, in my view, his absolute right to vote freely upon a matter of this kind, and it would be an impertinence on my part to suggest anything else." But now with magnificent inconsistency he achieved a complete *volte face* and declared: "It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is, the Bishops, together with the Clergy and Laity—must, in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that holy faith in its forms of worship." The State, then, had an "absolute right." But the Church also had an "inalienable right." And the two rights were not compatible.

But like the "little book" of the Apocalypse, the rejection proved to have been even sweet in the mouth in comparison with its bitterness in the belly. Dr. Lang, now Archbishop of Canterbury—then of York—had said in the Lords' debate on the Enabling Bill: "There is nothing in this Bill which affects the position of Parliament as the ultimate source of the sanction which must be given to any change affecting the Church of England in regard to its constitution. This Bill recognizes and desires to uphold the ultimate control of His Majesty and the two Houses of Parliament." But after digesting for two years the rejections which were the exercise of that ultimate control, he described the situation as precarious, adding that they were walking along a road then smooth, but where there were volcanic forces underneath. At any moment a crack might appear.

The new Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, who had been a leading promoter of the Enabling Bill under which the Revised Prayer Book was submitted to Parliament, spoke of a tension, an unwholesome situation, a position which was quite impossible, and stated that Church

administration was conducted perpetually on the edge of a precipice, only those of the inner circle knowing how constantly they were on the verge of that precipice, and how narrowly they escaped disaster. He declared that the Anglican Church would bear its testimony "if need be in opposition to the nation."

Dr. Garbett, Bishop of Winchester, considered it the gravest conflict since the Reformation, and said that it was better by far for the Church to lose its temporal and material possessions than to lose its freedom. The Bishop of Durham, Dr. Henson, hitherto a supporter of Establishment, became a vigorous Disestablisher over-night.

On the other hand, the Bishop of London referred to financial stringency in his diocese, and said he viewed the possibility of Disestablishment with dismay; while Dr. Pollock, Bishop of Norwich, declared that the Anglican parochial system could not survive Disendowment.

Anglicans at large were doubly disappointed at the *débâcle* because of the delusive if complacent benevolence with which Parliament had accepted (with one exception previously) the numerous Church proposals for legislation since the Enabling Act of 1919 made it comparatively easy for the Church to procure statutory authority for its decisions. It is interesting to recall in passing that Lord Haldane opposed that measure, telling the Lords with prophetic insight that a current had been set moving which in the long run would lead to Disestablishment.

But three other matters had long served to exacerbate Anglican resentment of State control. One was the State appointment of the Bishops who are, at least in name, the rulers of the Anglican Church; nomination by the Prime Minister works well, but sounds so ill, specially when the Prime Minister is a Baptist or Presbyterian. The second was the clash between the marriage law of the State and that of the State Church, as a result of which the State authorizes and compels its Church to recognize two classes of marriage which the latter forbids as, in the one case, incestuous, and in the other, adulterous. That there should thus be one law for the State and another for the Church seems to justify the Bishop of Birmingham's complaint that such a state of things is "most awkward." The third aggravation was that though when State control was

first imposed, Parliament was to consist entirely of Anglican communicants, to-day it can and does include Catholics and other Nonconformists, Jews, Agnostics, Atheists, and—in the case of the 1927 Parliament—a Parsee, all of whom had thus an absolute right, according to the chief spokesman of Anglicanism, to vote freely upon what Anglicans should and should not be allowed to do in their churches. It was not difficult for Anglicans to become indignant at the rejections of their proposed new Prayer Book.

Safe in the recollection that repressive legislation in 1874 had proved abortive in the face of a clerical persistence which was prepared to accept—and did accept—the Ritual Imprisonments in the spirit of the martyrs, the Bishops decided in effect to flout the Parliamentary decision and to assert as against it their own spiritual authority. Accordingly, on July 11th, 1929, they announced that “during the present emergency and until further order be taken,” they could not regard as inconsistent with loyalty to the principles of the Anglican Church any usage within the limits of the 1928 Book. They further announced that they, “in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion which belongs to each Bishop in his own diocese,” would be guided by the 1928 Book, and would try to ensure that clergy should cease all practices for which no provision was made either in the old Book of 1662 or in the new Book of 1928. And, finally, the Bishops announced that they would not allow the use of the new Book in any parish if the congregation objected. In the carrying out of this policy the Bishops were fortified with an assurance of “loyal support” from the clergy in Convocation, who, however, pointedly deleted from the motion a description of the Archbishop’s statement of policy as “clear and convincing.” Convocation was distinctly nervous of the possibility that the Bishops might use the crisis to increase their own power over the Clergy.

Their policy of defiance duly decided upon, the Bishops went on to publish the 1928 Book in many editions and in large quantities, but—is it possible that tongues were in episcopal cheeks?—carefully labelled: “The publication of this Book does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorized for use in church.”

All this done, the Bishops might well have rested on their oars, content that they had had the last word and the real victory. For the victory was indeed to them. It is true that the Revised Prayer Book has never become popular in the Church of England. Admittedly it has not secured widespread approval. Certainly it has not restored order to a Church where every man does that which is right in his own eyes. In fact, the Book is dead. But if a vicar wishes to use it he does so, and the fact that the Commons rejected it does not worry him or anybody else.

Parliament has thus been deprived by the Bishops and Clergy of all effective control over the services and doctrine of the Anglican Church, and deprived of it at the very moment in which Parliament thought to enforce it most deliberately. What is, of course, lost to the Bishops is the power of the civil arm to enforce their own doctrinal and ritual decisions, together with the power usually associated with the name of "Bishop" to achieve a similar enforcement. It is here that comprehensiveness becomes an embarrassment: the Bishops can draw the line, but Parliament will not suffer them to enforce it by the old statutory sanctions. Indeed, it is next to impossible to coerce beneficed clergy by legal process except for such matters as were at issue in the *Stiffkey* case. There is a Performance of Duties measure on the Statute Book, but it is practically a dead letter; the Bishops cannot rely on it since a certain clergyman successfully appealed to the High Court against one of them who had acted under it.

(A word in parenthesis, as to the ordinary methods of coercion adopted by Anglican Bishops may be of use here. They are:

(1) *Moral suasion*.—A vicar does not enjoy being at loggerheads with his bishop; it does not seem quite the thing. The bishop claims to be and to speak as a "Father in God." The vicar is told he makes the bishop's work difficult by standing out, and that his fellow-clergy do not support the vicar. If the bishop is inclined himself to be "high," he will assure the vicar that the cause both have at heart will only be injured by the independent action of extremists. The Bishop, as in Liverpool, may contemplate getting the clergy of the diocese together to pass a resolution of condemnation. The

vicar may reflect that he has taken an oath of canonical obedience to his bishop, though nothing is easier than to show that for practical purposes that oath means nothing. (2) *Refusal to licence Curates to the offending vicar's parish.*—This and the remaining "sanctions" are reserved as the ultimate bolts. No curate can lawfully function in a parish without either the bishop's permission or his licence under seal. If he does, he damns his prospects of one day getting a parish of his own. If the vicar of a busy town parish cannot get a curate, he has the misery of seeing his work inadequately done and his congregation fall away, while probably his own health will give out. (3) *Refusal to visit the offending vicar's church for Confirmation.*—This does not matter very much, as you can always take your candidates to a neighbouring church, where the bishop will do his office for the benefit of all comers, if they are duly presented by an incumbent. (4) *Refusal to countersign* the routine applications for the almost automatic grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or to make grants to the offender's parish from diocesan funds. So far as the writer is aware, this most alarmingly practical procedure has only been resorted to by Dr. Barnes of Birmingham, where the result has been to cast a halo round the epithet "rebel" and to rally High churchmen in financial support of their persecuted brethren and against the bishop; though it has also made things fairly difficult for the "rebels," as Dr. Barnes calls them.)

But the Anglican authorities felt that even their policy of public defiance and independent action was not an adequate answer to the moral rebuff of a House of Commons' assertion of Parliamentary control over Anglican doctrine and practice in such a *sanctum sanctorum* as Holy Communion. Resentment at the two rejections smouldered for two years, and finally flared up in a resolution in the Church Assembly on February 5th, 1930, which, after reciting the pronouncement of Archbishop Davidson, stated: "It is desirable that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the present relations of Church and State, and particularly how far the principle stated above is able to receive effective application in present circumstances in the Church of England, and what legal or constitutional changes, if any, are needed in order to maintain or secure its effective application: and that the Archbishops be requested to appoint a

Commission for this purpose." With that resolution it is arguable that prudence took to herself wings; that well should have been let alone, and sleeping dogs let lie.

The resolution was enthusiastically voted by 33 Bishops to 1, 198 Clergy to 38, and 151 Laity to 66; the Archbishop of Canterbury protesting that "the motion is in no sort of way a movement towards Disestablishment." On November 17th, 1930, the Archbishops announced a personnel of sixteen, under the curiously inappropriate chairmanship of Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, whose ancestors, William and Robert Cecil, according to Mr. Belloc, were "the true makers of Protestant England." It is the Report of this Commission that is now awaited.

On the whole it may be considered improbable that the Commission will recommend anything so clear-cut and unambiguous as Disestablishment. Such indications as there are suggest that efforts will be made to obtain—not freedom of action for the Church, that has been sufficiently won, but—a recognition of freedom without Disestablishment; the jam without the medicine. This would be urged on the ground that Disestablishment of the Church would be prejudicial to the highest interests of the State. Such has been the line conventionally taken by the Anglican Episcopate in the House of Lords and elsewhere when deprecating Disestablishment. Those who claim freedom without Disestablishment can point to the precedent of Scottish Presbyterianism.

One member of the Commission (Sir Charles Grant-Robertson, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University) enquired in a speech at last year's Congress: "Do you want to have the Head of the State in England like some other officers, one to whom it is a matter of his individual conscience as to whether he has any religious principles at all—in other words, that religious belief has nothing whatever to do with, and must not debar a person from occupying, the Throne?" Sir Charles concluded by saying: "A united Church must ask, and what a united Church asks, it is my belief it will get." Though these remarks illuminate for us the mind of Sir Charles, the delay in issuing the Report points to a difficulty in obtaining unanimity which may result in various minority Reports.

At the last meeting of the Church Assembly the Archbishop of York stated in reply to a question: "The

Report of the Commission on Church and State has been drafted: it has already been considered by the Commission, and has been referred to an editorial committee in respect of certain points. It is hoped that these will not be found to involve delay: if that hope is well founded, the Report will be presented to the two Archbishops at an early date. The time of publication is for the two Archbishops to determine." Perhaps the efforts of the editorial committee may achieve a *tour de force* of comprehensiveness and so avert the fatal weakness of minority Reports.

The present claim of the Anglican Church, then, is that it is answerable to God alone for its laws, doctrines and services, and that it must be acknowledged as sovereign in its own sphere. It has come to demand, in fact, the same independence of the State as that enjoyed by the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks for very many Anglicans when he claims identity between the post-Reformation and pre-Reformation Churches of England.

From the State's point of view, as from that of the Catholic Church, this claim is not justified by history, any more than would be a claim by the United States of America to be politically identical with the American Colonies of the time of George II. The Anglican Church was created by the State in the reign of Henry VIII precisely in order that an ecclesiastical claim of superiority to the State should no longer be made. The State can assert that Henry VIII, confronted by a spiritually independent Catholic Church in undisputed religious control of all England, induced or compelled its clergy to cease to be Catholics by repudiating the Pope and by taking their King as their spiritual head. In the words of the Statute 26 Hy. 8, Cap. 1: "Albeit the Kynges Majestie justely and rightfully is and oweth to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the Clergy of this Realme in theyr Convocations; yet nevertheless . . . Be it enacted by auctorite of this present Parliament that the King . . . shalbe takyn acceptyd and reputed the onely supreme heed in erthe of the Church of England."

For a quarter of a century the general body of doctrine to be held by the Church of England veered between Catholic and Protestant, the State finally imposing the

latter under the Elizabethan Settlement, when Parliament re-abolished the Mass, had the old Catholic altars removed and again set up a Ministry with powers expressly different from those of the Catholic Priesthood.

The former Catholic Church in England had now a spiritual allegiance and new doctrine, but it had largely the original personnel, except for the old Catholic Bishops. Save for the wealth of the monastic foundations and the shrines, which Henry and Edward had confiscated and distributed at the outset, the new anti-Catholic Church was suffered by the State to remain in possession of all the buildings and endowments which Catholics in England had brought together during many centuries for the maintenance and propagation of the Catholic Faith. The State further assisted its new Church by proscribing Catholicism, by enjoining the public to belong to the new Church under crippling penalties for refusals, and by making it treason for Catholic priests to work in this country.

John Citizen may say that whether or not these things were rightly done by the State is matter for debate between Catholic and Anglican theologians. But that they were in fact done is bare matter of history.

The State can claim further that conformably with its supremacy, it has prohibited the making of Canons in the absence of special permission in each case, has at different times during the intervening four hundred years proscribed the doctrines to be held by the State Church, has enacted various service books consistent with the current doctrine, and for a century and a half even silenced the official oracle of the Church of England as an entity by suppressing Convocation.

As Sir William Harcourt trenchantly informed the House of Commons in the Debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill: "The Reformation of religion in this country rested upon the great historical fact that the Sovereign and Parliament had refused to wait for the action or to obey the wishes of the Convocation. The Crown and Parliament very early took the reformation of religion out of the hands of Convocation, and dealt with it upon their own authority. It was not by the clergy that the Reformation was established in the reign of Elizabeth. The First Act of Uniformity was opposed

by all the Bishops in England." Harcourt might have added, indeed, that the Bill passed only by means of a creation of anti-Catholic peers.

Harcourt was right. Between May, 1558, and January, 1559, nine Catholic Sees in England had been rendered vacant through death, and they were left vacant. The holders of the remaining seventeen Sees opposed the Act, and they suffered deprivation under it to make way for their Anglican successors, Kitchin of Llandaff alone subsequently conforming and being re-instated. For the Act which they opposed provided an oath, a definition and a penalty. Because of what the definition showed the oath to involve, they refused the oath and suffered the penalty.

The oath was to be taken by "all and every Arch-bishoppe Bishoppe and all and every other Ecclesiasticall Pson." Its terms were: "I, A.B. doo utterly testifie and declare in my Conscience, that the Quenes Highnes is thonelye supreme Governour of this Realme . . . as well in all Spuall. or Ecclesiasticall Thinges or Causes as Temporall . . . and (I) shall assist and defende all Jurisdiccons. Preheminenes Privileges and Auctorities granted or belonging to the Quenes Highnes . . . or united or annexed to Thimperiall Crowne of this Realme."

The definition of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction which they were thus to swear to defend as vested in the Queen—"Such Jurisdiction Privileges Superiorities and Preheminenes Spuall. and Ecclesiasticall as by any spirituall or Ecclesiasticall Power or Aucthorite hathe heretofore bene or may lawfully be exercised or used for the Visitacon. of the Ecclesiasticall State and Psons. and for Reformacon. Order and Correcon. of the same and of all maner of Errours . . . shall for ever by aucthorite of this pnt. Plamt. be united and annexed to the Imperiall Crowne of this Realme." Here, indeed, was the real Pope Joan.

The penalty for refusing the Oath?—"Yf any suche Archbishoppe Bishoppe or other Ecclesiasticall Officer or Minister . . . shall pemptorilie. or obstinatlie refuse to take or receive the said Othe, that then he so refusing shall forfaite and lose . . . all and every Ecclesiasticall and Spuall. Promocon. Benefice and Office. . . . And that the whole Title Interest and Incumbencye in every

suche . . . Office . . . shall clearly cease and bee voide as though the ptie. so refusing were deade."

For those who stood for ecclesiastical independence of the State there was thus no place in the reformed Church of England—they were as "deade." If they chose to remain within it and continued to receive the ancient endowments, they did so at the price of submission to State control. It was a bargain, and herein lies the answer to the High Church claim to be freed from the State on the ground that the Reformation lacked—as Harcourt, a Low Churchman, proclaimed—the free consent of the clergy. The clergy were not bound to consent to the Reformation. Campion, Southworth and the rest, were free to dissent—and to die. They did both.

At the Reformation, then, the State outlawed a Church to which it was opposed, and confiscating the properties of that Church conferred them upon a new Church placed by Statute under State control, frightening or bribing the last Catholic priests in that England into becoming the first Anglican Ministers. If the Church of England now desires to depart from that original constitution and to achieve independence, retaining nothing of Establishment but the name, then Anglicans are the last people in the world who are entitled to deny that the State may take away what it gave. A repudiation of State control voids the State's contract with the Church of England for failure of consideration in the legal sense of the term.

Increase in money values and (during the last hundred years) careful financial administration by the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty, and further benefactions during four hundred years, have vastly increased the value of the original Catholic endowments which the State transferred to the Church of England. As a going concern, the Anglican Church is now worth probably well over the breathless sum of £600,000,000. That sum is arrived at by adding together the value of present-day endowments, the capitalized value of goodwill as represented by voluntary contributions (e.g., church collections), and the capitalized value of buildings now in possession of the Church of England (its churches in more than 13,000 parishes, its vicarages and rectories, its halls and schools).

That this vast wealth, designed for the religious

service of the whole nation, should now be devoted to so small a percentage of the community, is another factor which the State is entitled to take into consideration in determining the extent of Disendowment. When the State Church was established, every Englishman belonged to it by law. To-day not more than ten per cent. of the population attend Anglican services, and though the Anglican clergy are slightly on the increase¹—there are to-day more than 17,000 in England alone—Anglican Baptisms, Communion and Sunday School attendances are on the decline—i.e., the devout of the present, and both devout and nominal of the future. Roughly another ten per cent. of our population are Catholics, and a further ten per cent. are adherents of other Dissenting Churches. The remaining seventy per cent. of the nation "go nowhere." The State might well consider that if a ten per cent. adherence to the State Church is disappointing, a repudiation of State control, coupled with a demand by the ten per cent. to retain the vast funds intended to provide for the other ninety per cent. as well, would be quite intolerable.

How much shall be left to the Church of England? Who shall benefit by what is resumed by the State? No doubt the one body which will not be suffered in any way to benefit will be that from which the original moneys were seized by the State—the Catholic Church.

Before Disestablishment and the appropriate measure of Disendowment could come about, various perplexing questions must be settled. Would the King, who now when in England must be an Anglican and when in Scotland a Presbyterian, be free after Disestablishment to become a Baptist or a Catholic? Who would crown his successor and where? Could the Lord Chancellor

¹ But not yet at the rate which is needed. In 1930 the Editor of Crockford stated in one of his famous Prefaces that he estimated that the Anglican Ministry required "1,200 new men a year for the next ten years. After that an annual average of 700 should suffice." Had this requirement been met, 7,200 "new men" would have been ordained during the six years following the publication of those words. Actually, only 3,292 have been ordained in the period. But this figure for 1930-35 is an improvement on the figure for the preceding six years, which was only 2,297.

be a Catholic?" Would there be no longer religious representation in the House of Lords, where at present twenty-six Anglican Bishops sit? Would Anglican clergy and Catholic priests then be permitted to sit in the House of Commons, as Nonconformist ministers have long done? Who would own and control important churches like Westminster Abbey?

Even more difficult and thorny than these would be the problem of the doctrinal basis for a Disestablished Church. The Elizabethan Settlement provided a Protestant basis for the Church of England, but with a sufficient ambiguity to make it possible for persons of widely differing beliefs to belong to it. As a result, it still deliberately houses beneath the same roof such centrifugal forces as those represented by High Churchmen, Modernists, and Evangelicals. This fact has led its critics to describe the Anglican Church as "a federated chaos," and its Jeremiahs to prophesy the arrival of a chaos which is not federated. Certain it is that the ever-present danger of the Church of England throughout its four hundred years has been that one party or another might capture the ecclesiastical machine, and make a continuance within it impossible for the other two. With State control gone, that tendency would be intensified.

As the present Prime Minister said in the House of Commons at the Debate on the Revised Prayer Book: "The comprehensiveness, that spirit of compromise that

² Perhaps a Catholic is not excluded now. "Among the many cases which were laid before me for opinion at this time" (some forty years ago), "I remember one which consisted of a blank sheet with a substantial fee and the names of three other well-known Counsel, junior to myself, who were to advise with me. The questions were two:—

"(1) Could a Roman Catholic be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and

"(2) Could a Roman Catholic be Lord Chancellor of Great Britain?

... I gave an opinion, in which my fellow-counsel concurred, that a Roman Catholic could, on the true construction of the statutes, hold the offices. I afterwards discovered that the real client who had taken my opinion was Lord Russell of Killowen, then Lord Chief Justice of England."—Lord Haldane, *Autobiography*, p. 67 *et seq.*

has been the mark of the Church of England for centuries at her best—how many people in this House believe that it would survive Disestablishment? Can anyone doubt that, between these elements that have made the Church for nearly four centuries, you could not tell which party in the Church might expel the other : but you would have two or three bodies ultimately in the place of one and in the place of that comprehensiveness." The State will have to decide whether it is prepared to acquiesce in this, or whether it intends to devise means for a compulsory comprehensiveness in the future as in the past. And it is probably over that, rather than over the details of Disendowment, that the storm would rage.

It is, indeed, for the killing of comprehensiveness that the High Church leaders have laboured to fan the spark of discontent into a raging flame of destruction. But religious leaders in the history of England have not uncommonly found it easier to kindle a flame than to control it—a lesson of which High Churchmen should need no reminder. And—to change the metaphor—readers of the Gospels will remember that it is possible for a garment to become so ramshackle that even a patch is dangerous.

As much from such considerations of danger in putting too much in issue, as from the characteristic Anglican love of evasion and compromise, proposals for formal Disestablishment are likely to be shelved, whatever the Commission recommends. Certainly the natural nervousness of the Modernist and Evangelical parties would impel them to obstruction at every stage and over every point. And probably the State would be willing to-day to swallow any amount of independence and rebellion on the part of Anglicanism rather than have the political arena occupied with ecclesiastical warfare.

Since this article was written the Report has appeared; it bears out generally the views here expressed.

Ma
nit
the
an
the
Ch
im
poi
dep
Fel
me
po
pec
Hu
ore
the
cor
wit
reg
in
un
thi
Inn
the
rav
Lat
obl
lon

30
p. 8

THE VICISSITUDES OF FREQUENT COMMUNION

(Second Article—Conclusion)

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

ONE would naturally expect that the heyday of the Middle Ages would witness a great revival of frequent communion. For it was then that under the inspiration of St. Bernard the Sacred Manhood of Christ attained its full measure of recognition as the vehicle of sanctity. "The great novelty, the incomparable value of the mediæval religion is an understanding and love, or rather a passion, for the Humanity of Christ; the Incarnate Word, *homo Christus Jesus*, is no longer merely the Model to be imitated, the Guide to be followed, or from another point of view, the Uncreated Light which illumines the depths of the soul; He is also the Spouse of the soul, her Fellow-worker and her Friend."³⁰ The "*Jesu dulcis memoria*" is the fairest flower of mediæval religious poetry. Because of the trend of its spirituality, the age is peculiarly rich in devotions which concern the Sacred Humanity; it dwells lovingly on the Holy Name, "*mel in ore, in aure melos, in corde jubilus*"; on the Mysteries of the Infancy; on the Passion; and, in the monasteries and convents, on the Sacred Heart; and, since the Mother goes with the Son, on Mary, "*raptrix cordium*," "*santa mamma regina*." But in the one matter of frequent communion, in the use of that Sacrament in which men express their union with Christ and are sanctified by His Humanity, this great age is found to be completely wanting. Pope Innocent III emphasized the truth that men must eat of the heavenly Bread if they are to be protected from the ravening spirit, but at the same time, in the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), he reduced the communion of obligation to one in the year, instead of the three that had long obtained, "on account of the abundance of iniquity,

³⁰ Père Rousselot, quoted in Vernet, *Mediæval Spirituality*, p. 89.

the charity of many having grown cold," as St. Thomas says in sorrow. St. Louis of France communicated six times a year; St. Elizabeth of Hungary three. Among the new religious, the Poor Clares had by rule seven communions a year, the Bridgettines four, unless God inspired them with greater devotion when they might, with the advice of their confessor, communicate every Saturday; the Gilbertine lay brothers, choir novices and sisters eight, lay novices three. The Constitution of Benedict XII for the Benedictines ordered monthly communion, at least, for the monks who were not priests. Among priests there was considerable variety of practice with regard to the saying of Mass. Thus St. Thomas of Canterbury did not say Mass daily, St. Edmund did. The married clergy naturally refrained from celebrating except rarely. Among the religious the Carthusians celebrated on feasts and pro-feasts; Benedictines in their monasteries two or three times a week, but in the universities once a week; Gilbertine priests, when novices, did not say Mass at all, but after profession they celebrated at the will of the prior.

Still, the leaders of thought, the scholastic doctors, did recommend frequent communion, thus keeping alive the tradition of it in the Church. But they did not always speak with the same firmness, nor indeed with the same conception of frequency. St. Albert the Great, for example, seems to regard monthly communion as frequent. It was frequent, I suppose, relatively to the practice of Saints even of that day; but it is in no sense frequent according to the standard of to-day, used as we are to St. Alphonsus's definition of frequency as meaning several times a week. St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas may be taken as representing the best mediæval teaching; they are in substantial agreement, and their doctrine remained standard in the schools until the Council of Trent. St. Bonaventure divided men into three classes. Those who are always prepared and have the fervour of the early Christians may receive daily;³¹ those who are

³¹ The scholastics believed that the early Christians received daily, not merely from the information given in Acts II, but also from a stringent canon traditionally ascribed to Pope Anacletus, which had been accepted among the Decretals because of its supposed origin. The canon reads: "After the conse-

cold and sluggish in piety should receive rarely; those who are of the middle sort, who have neither the purity of the first Christians nor the torpor of later days, should take a middle course, sometimes refraining that they may learn to reverence, sometimes approaching that they may be inflamed by love.³² St. Thomas in his turn praises daily communion, but only for those in whom it increases the fire of charity and does not diminish reverence. For those who tend to develop a spirit of routine, he advises some abstinence that they may recover fervour. On the question always debated in the Church as to whether it was better for the devout to receive often, in love and confidence, or rarely, out of reverential fear, he decides in favour of frequent reception. But on all these questions he leaves a man to his own conscience, as St. Augustine did before him.³³

In the later Middle Ages there was the same variety among priests with regard to the celebration of Mass as there had been in the thirteenth century; but the faithful for the most part, except when in some locality they were roused by a preacher such as St. Vincent Ferrer, remained comparative strangers to Holy Communion.

The Council of Trent here, as in so many other matters, initiated a reform. It spoke of the Eucharist as "the antidote by which we are delivered from daily faults and preserved from mortal sins." It exhorted the faithful "to believe and venerate the sacred mysteries of Christ's Body and Blood with such constancy and firmness of faith, such devotion of soul, such piety and religion that they would be able frequently to receive the substantial Bread."³⁴ The Council also expressed the

cratation let all communicate who do not wish to be deprived of entry to the church." The canon is nowadays ascribed to the fifth or sixth century. Its author is unknown; and its import is doubtful. Some have said that it refers only to clerics. The tradition of the Church is opposed to the notion that the laity were ever anywhere bound under sin to daily reception. "Although there was the practice of communicating daily, nevertheless a precept binding all under grave sin to daily communion is neither sufficiently proved nor easily believable" (de Lugo, *De Sac. Euch.*, XVI, sect. 2, n. 29).

³² In IV Sent., D. 12, p. II, a. 2, q. 2.

³³ In IV Sent., D. 12, q. III, a. 1; and Summa, III, q. 80, a. 10.

³⁴ Sess. XIII, cap. 2, and 7.

desire that at each Mass the faithful who were present should communicate not only with spiritual desire but also with sacramental reception of the Eucharist."³⁵ The Catechism of the Council told parish priests that they must get the people to consider the nourishment of the soul as necessary as that of the body; and it laid down as a norm of conduct: "The faithful must not consider it enough to receive the Body of the Lord once a year only; they should be given to know that communion ought to be more frequent; but whether it is advisable that it should be monthly, weekly or daily cannot be determined by a fixed rule."³⁶

The new religious communities, Jesuits, Theatines, Oratorians, and others, took up the reforming effort encouraged by the Council. But it was considered advisable to proceed with caution. The people were unused to frequent reception, and to encourage it unreservedly might lead them to adopt it without proper regard to due dispositions. The moral theologians were rightly concerned about dispositions. A rule of guidance was drawn up for the Jesuits by Laynez: "*Ut pium est ad frequenter communicandum fideles exhortari, ita quos ad id propensos viderint, admonere debent ne crebrius quam octavo die accedant, praesertim si matrimonio sint coniuncti.*"³⁷ The great Jesuit moralists, Toletus, Vasquez, Suarez, Laymann, de Lugo, set forth this rule in the schools and in their writings. Suarez says: "*Generatim loquendo, consultius est frequentius communicare, quam rarius; magisque est in frequentiam quam in raritatem inclinandum, considerando actum ipsum absolute, seu ex suo genere. Haec est communis sententia Theologorum, D. Thom., etc.*" He quotes or refers to a number of theologians; and then explains four reasons why frequent communion is better, absolutely speaking. He continues: "*In particulari non potest una regula dari de frequentia, quae omnibus expediat, sed pro diversitate statuum et morum id est prudenti arbitrio definiendum. Haec conclusio tam per se nota est ut non indigeat probatione. Ut tamen in re morali rationem aliquam insinuemus ad ferendum prudens iudicium,*

³⁵ Sess. XXII, cap. 6.

³⁶ Pt. II, ch. 4, nn. 58 and 63.

³⁷ *Regulae Sacerdotum*, XXVI.

videtur sane raro esse alicui consulendum ut ordinaria consuetudine *frequentius quam octavo quoque die communicet*. Ita significant doctores citati; et ita sentiunt prudentes et experti viri in hac materia, et communis usus Ecclesiae non parum favet . . . ita est haec doctrina accipienda ut non intelligatur, omnibus hominibus omnibusque statibus uniformiter applicanda; nam *continentibus frequentius convenire potest quam coniugatis, et religiosis quam laicis*; solum ergo assignamus regulam, quae facilius potest fere in omnibus observari, qui timoratum conscientiam habent."³⁸ Suarez agrees with St. Bernard that for frequent communion it is not necessary to be free from the affection for venial sins or to feel a more intense devotion and charity.

St. Francis de Sales follows the common view of his day. He adopts the teaching of Gennadius of Marseilles, refusing to praise or condemn daily communion, but counselling weekly communion, provided the soul is without affection for sin. But whereas Gennadius and those of his time understood by this last phrase the absence of affection for mortal sin, St. Francis understands it of sin simply. Hence he writes: "To communicate once a week, it is necessary to be free from mortal sin and to be without affection to venial sin, and to have a great desire to communicate; but to communicate every day, it is also necessary to have conquered the greater part of our evil inclinations."³⁹

But there were several theologians in Spain, outside the Jesuit order, who opposed the teaching I have outlined. These insisted that the only disposition required for daily communion is the state of grace. The Holy Eucharist was not given as the perquisite of the perfect; on the contrary one becomes perfect by daily reception of the Sacrament. The influence of these theologians was widespread in Spain. The laity began to frequent the sacraments. But unfortunately devotion went to an extreme, partly, no doubt, because the theologians were so emphatic on the value of daily communion but not equally emphatic on the dispositions required *ex congruentia*. The people got hold of the belief that daily communion was *de iure divino*. Therefore they began to

³⁸ In IIIam, q. lxxx., a. 11, disp. LXIX, sect. iv., n. 6 and 7.

³⁹ *Devout Life*, Pt. 2, ch. 20 (The Orchard Books).

receive at home regularly, if it was inconvenient to go to church; they received in bed, even when not ill; they communicated on Good Friday. And the priests themselves encouraged these practices. They carried Holy Communion privately to the houses of the people, without any regard to the rubrics; they distributed many Hosts at a time or large Hosts; they absolved from venial sins without jurisdiction. Innocent XI had to intervene to check the abuse. After much deliberation the Congregation of the Council, by decree of February 15th, 1679, recalled to them the traditional teaching of the Holy See on the proper dispositions for reception and repudiated the view that daily communion was of divine law. It reminded them that, while merchants and married people could not be excluded as a body from daily reception, neither could they be admitted *en bloc* by the application of one principle; they must be judged worthy or unworthy as individuals by the prudent decision of the confessor. With regard to nuns the Congregation ruled that they must first obey the statutes of their order which determined the days of communion; "Si quae vero puritatis eniteant et fervore spiritus ita incaluerint, ut dignae frequentiore aut quotidiana ss. Sacramenti perceptione videri possint, id illis a Superioribus permittatur." A month previously Pope Innocent had condemned two lax principles of some moral theologians on the question of communion. One affirmed that the precept of annual communion was fulfilled by a sacrilegious reception; the other that frequent confession and communion was a mark of predestination even in those who live as the Gentiles.

In France the Holy See had to meet quite the opposite error, the rigour of Jansenism. Arnould published his book on frequent communion in 1643, and in it maintained that a sinner made a sacrilegious communion if he had not done condign penance according to the standards of Antiquity before receiving absolution, and that no one was worthy to receive who had not the purest love of God without alloy. The decree of the Congregation of the Council of 1679 was directed against this perverse doctrine as well as against the Spanish laxity; in 1690 Alexander VIII formally condemned the two propositions of Arnould. But his book had already done much harm in Jansenist and semi-Jansenist circles and among those who

had a certain sympathy with the revival of rigour. Catholic theologians made a strenuous resistance. Modern writers, however, observe that the theologians of the time were hampered in their efforts to stem the Jansenist tide by their own theory of the necessary dispositions for frequent communion.⁴⁰

The attitude of the Holy See, subsequent to its decisions of 1679 and 1690, is clearly seen in the instruction of Propaganda to the Vicar Apostolic of Sutchuen (April 19th, 1784). The salient points of the letter are: the only essential disposition for communion is the state of grace; freedom from all affection for venial sins cannot be necessary, for in that case, the desire of the Council of Trent that the people should receive communion each day at Mass would be illusory; communion, like bodily food, is the nourishment of our weakness; it is inconsistent to demand for it special dispositions far beyond those required for absolution. Among the theologians of the time there was a growing tendency to allow more scope to confessors in permitting their penitents to receive frequently. In France opinion varied. Lacroix maintained a stricter view; Fénelon encouraged, from the practice of the primitive church, a return to daily communion. The teaching of St. Alphonsus is thus summarized by Dublanchy⁴¹: persons are to be allowed and even advised to receive weekly communion, if they do not commit mortal sin, or commit it through frailty with an earnest effort to reform; those who have not the habit of deliberate venial sin and are making efforts to mortify their passions and grow in virtue may go to communion several times a week; those who have these same dispositions in a more developed form may be permitted to go daily. But when explaining in detail the disposition for daily communion St. Alphonsus is rather exacting. He asks for freedom from affection to deliberate venial sin, the devotion of a good part of one's time to mental prayer and the mortification of the senses and the passions.⁴²

⁴⁰ Cf. Dublanchy in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, III, col. 539. He also points out that some Catholic theologians, especially in France, were affected by Arnauld. He mentions especially Contenson, *Theologia mentis et cordis*.

⁴¹ Op. cit., col. 543-545.

⁴² *Pratica di amar Gesù Cristo*, c. viii., n. 27.

But it is doubtful if he would have insisted on prolonged mental prayer as a condition in an otherwise well-disposed soul: in his well-known *Praxis Confessarii* he does not mention it. The moral theologians of the nineteenth century adopted, for the most part, the authoritative teaching of St. Alphonsus.

Towards the close of the century a strong movement was noticeable in the Church among the religious communities and the faithful generally towards frequent communion. It was the first opening of our magnificent Eucharistic life. Leo XIII fostered it from the outset. He approved of the advice of confessors who allowed their religious penitents to receive daily, and decided that the confessor alone was competent in such matters which were outside the scope of the religious superior. Then in 1902 he issued his magnificent Encyclical, *Mirae caritatis*. In burning words the aged Pontiff aroused the Catholic world to a true appreciation of the Blessed Sacrament. "Sed in eo praecipue est elaborandum, ut frequens Eucharistiae usus apud catholicas gentes late reviviscat. Id monent nascentis Ecclesiae . . . exempla, id Conciliorum decreta, id auctoritas Patrum et sanctissimorum ex omni aetate virorum; ut enim corpus, ita animus cibo saepe indiget suo; alimoniam autem maxime vitalem praebet sacrosancta Eucharistia. Itaque praeiudicatae adversantium opiniones, inanes multorum timores, speciosae abstinendi causae penitus tollendae; ea enim agitur res, qua nihil fideli populo utilius tum ad redimendum tempus et sollicitis rerum mortalium curis, tum ad christianos revocandos spiritus constanterque retinendos. Huc sane magno erunt momento praestantiorum ordinum hortationes et exempla, maximo autem cleri navitas et industria. Sacerdotes enim, quibus Christus Redemptor Corporis et Sanguinis sui mysteria conficiendi ac dispensandi tradidit munus, nihil profecto melius pro summo accepto honore queant respondere, quam ut Ipsius eucharisticam gloriam omni ope provehant, optatisque SS. Cordis eius obsequendo, animos hominum ad salutiferos tanti Sacramenti Sacrificiique fontes invitent ac pertrahant."⁴

One man shall sow and another shall reap. Leo passed

⁴ A.S.S., Vol. 34, pp. 642 et seq.

to his reward before he saw the fruit of his appeal. Pius X entered into his labours, and to him it was given to restore the Mystical Christ by the Sacramental Christ. It was the greatest work of his great Pontificate. The famous decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, which was issued on December 20th, 1905, put an end once for all to the baleful *sequelæ* of Jansenism. In virtue of that decree daily communion must be open to all the faithful of every order and status. The only absolutely necessary interior conditions for fruitful reception are the state of grace and a right intention. Freedom from affection for deliberate venial sins is a desirable, but not a necessary condition; frequent communion will itself eliminate such affection. The confessor's function is to advise those who should receive daily; but he must always advise in conformity with the regulations of the Holy See. Religious houses, seminaries and schools must foster frequent and daily communion. Where the rules of a religious institute lay down only certain days of communion, such rules must be regarded as merely directive and not prescriptive, except in the sense of determining a minimum of observance. Finally, ecclesiastical writers are forbidden for the future to take sides on the dispositions requisite for frequent and daily communion.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ A.S.S., Vol. 38, pp. 400 et seq.

PURITANISM AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

By ARNOLD LUNN.

AND God saw that it was good." . . . He saw that sex was good, that wine was good, and indeed that all the natural appetites with which He endowed us are very good indeed.

But Adam fell, and with sin there came into the world that distrust of the natural appetites which is the oldest and most enduring of heresies. We find this heresy in Plato, who speaks with contempt of "the foolishness of the body." We find it in the teaching of the Orphics whose cheerful slogan, "the body a tomb" filtered into and infected the Christian world.

This ancient heresy raised its ugly head again towards the conclusion of the third century, reappeared as Manicheism and selected as the target for its attack the pleasures of sex, of wine and of meat. At the end of the first millennium Manicheism reached its logical climax in the Catharist heresy. The Catharists condemned the appetite for life, praised suicide, taught that procreation was the worst of sins, and that a mother who had committed this unpardonable lapse should atone for her sin by murdering her child.

Manicheism reappeared in the sixteenth century as Calvinistic Puritanism, and now it was the natural appetite for beauty which was condemned. The glories of mediæval glass and sculpture fell beneath the onslaught of the new Manichees. The most notable outbreak of Manicheism in modern times was that which cursed the United States with Prohibition.

In the past the Manichee has attacked the pleasures of sex, wine, meat and beauty. The modern Manichee attacks the natural appetite for God and the hunger for truth. The new psychologist is the old Manichee in modern dress. Man has a natural appetite for truth, and the new psychology accordingly sets to work to prove that reason is nothing more than the slave of instinct, that our beliefs are nothing more than the product of environment, volition and sex, that the arguments by which we defend them are invented to justify conclusions which have been imposed upon us by our

particular brand of sex complex, and—in effect—that objective truth is unobtainable. The Freudian, as I have elsewhere pointed out, has forgotten that this line of attack can be used with equal effect to discredit the arguments with which Freud defends Freudianism. Indeed, if we accept the conclusions of the new psychology, we can accept no conclusions, including the conclusions of the new psychology. Those who begin by denying the existence of God end by denying the power of the human mind to arrive at rational conclusions.

These new Puritans have done their work only too well. The Catholic apologist has to convince those who become increasingly distrustful as the strength of the Catholic case becomes more apparent. "It all fits together very nicely," a friend of mine remarked, "but the case for Catholicism is too plausible to be really convincing."

Either the case for Catholicism is weak, in which case Catholicism can obviously be rejected, or it is strong, in which case it is too plausible to be convincing. Catholicism, it seems, would be more convincing if it was less convincing.

Puritanism owes much of its venom to the instinct which seeks to deprive others of that pleasure from which we are debarred. The neo-Puritan who has cut himself off from God by sin or by servile acquiescence in the fashion of a clique is naturally anxious to deprive others of the happiness which he has forfeited. And because pleasure is suspect to the Puritan, he exploits as an argument against the existence of God the happiness which God has prepared for those that love Him.

The natural appetite which finds pleasurable certainty in the statement that twice three equals six is already suspect. Professor J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S., professes himself "willing to consider the possibility of exceptions to 'it'." "It" being the statement that "If there are any two sets of three beings, then the total number in those two sets is six."¹ The Puritanism which vents its spleen on the multiplication table is closely allied to the Puritanism which distrusts the greatest and most natural of all appetites, the appetite for God.

¹ *Science and the Supernatural*, p. 250.

Every convert from agnosticism passes through the stage when the intellectual strength of the Catholic case become apparent, and yet Catholicism itself seems fantastic. To a friend who was in this transition stage I said: "You will stick where you are unless you make the venture of faith. All that we can do for you is to show that the arguments against Catholicism can be met, and that the case for Catholicism is infinitely stronger than for any rival philosophy. But you've got to do the rest. If you are prepared to admit the force of the arguments for God's existence, why not resume the practice you discarded many years ago, and ask His guidance and His help?"

To this my friend replied: "If I started praying I should never really know whether belief, if it came, was an answer to prayer or the result of auto-suggestion. Indeed, one of my strongest reasons for distrusting all your arguments is the fact that God does seem to satisfy some kind of need, and may therefore be nothing more than the creation of the mind, a fiction which the mind evolves to fill an aching gap."

Here is the letter in which I tried to combat this particular inhibition.

Dear —,

I have often noticed that modern sceptics use as an argument against religion the consequences which inevitably follow if religion be true. If God exists and wishes us to enter into relations with Him, life without God must be frustrated and incomplete. If it be true, as St. Augustine says, that the soul is made for God, and can find no rest until it rests in the God that made it, the happiness which religion offers is not the happiness of the drugged but the happiness of the liberated intellect.

It is absurd to cite as an argument against the existence of God consequences which are inevitable if God exists. The longing for God may be smothered beneath successive strata of self-indulgence and sin, but there is no soul which has never felt the desire for God. Have you ever reflected on the fact that if this universal longing does not correspond to some objective reality, it is the only universal appetite which feeds on complete illusion? The hunger for God, like the hunger for food

and the hunger for a mate, is a craving for something objectively real.

To argue that the hunger for God disproves the existence of God is as irrational as to maintain that the belief in the existence of cows is an example of "wish-fulfilment" because the thought of beef makes a hungry man's mouth water.

Nature employs pain as a warning that something is wrong, and pleasure as an encouragement. The Creator has associated happiness with the physical processes necessary for the continuance of life, eating, drinking and mating, and with the spiritual processes necessary for the gaining of eternal life. And, if Nature be our guide, the fact that religion offers you happiness is evidence not of its falsity but of its truth. Manicheism, oldest of all heresies, adapts itself with chameleon-like skill to the changing fashions of the day. The pleasures of sex and wine have been condemned in the past. In our own age the neo-Puritans are concentrating on denouncing the happiness which is associated with religion. Do not, I beg of you, allow these Puritan complexes to deprive you of religious joy. If God exists, it is He that is calling you, and if the devil exists, it is he who is holding you back.

"But supposing that neither God nor the devil exist?" you reply. "Supposing that this desire to find peace in religion is nothing more than a form of auto-suggestion?"

I reply that the mere fact that you are reluctant to pray to God before you are completely convinced that He exists is in itself evidence of His existence. If there be no God, and if we are nothing more than ill-regulated machines reacting mechanically to certain external stimuli, there is no rational explanation of this categorical command to reject consoling falsehood and to accept comfortless truth in its place. If, however, God does exist, no sacrifice is too great to discover truth, for truth is one aspect of the eternal God.

You assume that you can avoid being duped by the simple expedient of avoiding a decision. You are wrong. If God does not exist, you may dupe yourself by praying to Him, and lull your intellect to sleep by auto-suggestion, but if the devil exists he may be doing his

best to dupe you into postponing your decision. If religion be true, you are devil-duped if you play the waiting game, and if religion be false, you may be auto-duped by the time you fall upon your knees. There is no certain insurance against being duped. In this connection let me quote a passage from that essay by William James which he originally intended to call "The Right to Believe," but which he finally decided, unfortunately, I think, to call *The Will to Believe*.

"We cannot escape the issue by remaining sceptical and waiting for more light, because, although we do avoid error in that way *if religion be untrue*, we lose the good, *if it be true*, just as certainly as if we positively chose to disbelieve. It is as if a man should hesitate indefinitely to ask a certain woman to marry him because he was not perfectly sure that she would prove an angel after he brought her home. Would he not cut himself off from that particular angel-possibility as decisively as if he went and married someone else? Scepticism then, is not avoidance of option; it is option of a certain particular kind of risk. *Better risk loss of truth than chance of error*—that is your faith-vetoer's exact position. He is actively playing his stake as much as the believer is; he is backing the field against the religious hypothesis, just as the believer is backing the religious hypothesis against the field. To preach scepticism to us as a duty until 'sufficient evidence' for religion be found, is tantamount therefore to telling us, when in presence of the religious hypothesis, that to yield to our fear of its being error is wiser and better than to yield to our hope that it may be true. It is not intellect against all passions, then; it is only intellect with one passion laying down its law. And by what, forsooth, is the supreme wisdom of this passion warranted? Dupery for dupery, what proof is there that dupery through hope is so much worse than dupery through fear?"

Or again, to take another illustration, let us suppose that you have crossed an Alpine Pass and fought your way down through a raging storm to the last crevasse which separates you from easy ground. You are alone, and the light is failing, and your only hope of escaping death through exposure is to try your luck and leap the crevasse. Faith murmurs: "You can just clear the

crevasse"; scepticism replies: "If you jump, you will never reach the other side." If you refuse to leap, you will be frozen to death; if you back your faith your leap may fail, but, even so, your position will be no worse than if you remained where you are. You have everything to gain and nothing to lose by making the venture of faith.

Here, as so often, faith represents not only the triumph of courage of cowardice but the triumph of reason over emotion, for it is reasonable to take a chance of death in the crevasse rather than to await certain death passively.

Many years ago I was overtaken by night and storm while ski-ing alone among the Oberland glaciers. The storm was uncomfortable, but by no means unbearable, and my position was not so desperate as in the imaginary case which I have just quoted by way of illustration. Reason, indeed, insisted that I had nothing serious to worry about. The cold, though unpleasant, was by no means unendurable, and provided that I kept moving and did not lose heart, I knew that I would certainly survive the experience. Emotion disagreed, for to emotion the driving mist and snow and the black darkness were the only surviving realities in a world from which colour and warmth and light had vanished as for ever. Emotion sneered at my faith in the life to come, the life which would return with the dawn upon a frozen world. Emotion was quite convinced that this belief in the coming day was nothing more than a case of wish-fulfilment.

There are moments even in the lives of the saints when it is difficult to believe that the sun of faith will return and disperse the dark mists of doubt, and at such moments reason has to struggle hard against emotion. Many of those who succumb to exposure among the mountains die because they have lost the will to live, because their reason has proved weaker than their emotions, and because it is easier to die than to continue the fight. A price must be paid both here and hereafter for salvation.

"... as the essence of courage is to stake one's life on a possibility, so the essence of faith is to believe that the possibility exists. . . ."

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST IN THE TEACHING OF ST. JOHN EUDES

BY THE REV. HERBERT H. J. CREES.

BORN in 1601, St. John Eudes, after a saintly childhood, entered the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of twenty-two to study for the priesthood.

Here it was that he came under the influence of Père de Bérulle and Père de Condren upon whose deeply spiritual teachings he formed his religious life. He found himself in a school of ascetical theology which was described as austere; a school which built always upon a solidly dogmatic foundation; which emphasized the abject condition of man after the Fall in order to show more vividly how much Christ did for man in the Redemption and hence how deep is the obligation which binds man to His service. Into these teachings, St. John entered heart and soul and conceived a mission to develop and complete them: to follow them out fearlessly in all their implications, first in his own life and then in his writings, so that they might effect in others what they had already wrought in his own soul.

The teaching of St. John Eudes, however arduous to practise, is easy to understand because it is a perfect whole, a beautifully co-ordinated system which finds its unity in the Person of our Blessed Lord. The saint sees more clearly perhaps than anyone since St. Paul all that is involved in the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and particularly in the bond which exists between Jesus and each individual. So much is this the case that all his writings really resolve themselves into a commentary upon the words: "Now I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). To St. John Eudes the Christian life and the Christian virtues have meaning only in so far as they are practised "per Ipsum et cum Ipso, et in Ipso."

The extent to which this doctrine permeates all his works is brought out with force and clarity by Père Lebrun, C.J.M., in his recent book: *The Spiritual Teaching of St. John Eudes*, of which an English translation by Dom Basil Whelan, O.S.B., has been published

by Messrs. Sands & Co. While disclaiming to have given anything like a definitive synthesis of the Saint's teachings, he has certainly laid down the lines upon which such a synthesis must be made. He points out that at the time when St. John wrote, spiritual books were not lacking: conspicuous among them were the *Introduction to the Devout Life* and the *Treatise on the Love of God* by St. Francis de Sales. But St. John felt that these did scant justice to the great doctrines of which he was the apostle: namely, our incorporation with Christ through baptism and our consequent obligations to Him. They dealt with them indeed, but only in passing, whereas to St. John Eudes they were the beginning and the end of the spiritual life. It was, therefore, to supply a great need that in 1637 he wrote *La Vie et le Royaume de Jésus dans les Ames Chrétiennes*.

As he wrote, St. John had always in his mind the purpose for which he was working: to present his teaching to men and women not as an exercise in speculative theology, but as a working system, an intensely practical method which would not be too difficult to follow. Thus in his works we find the loftiest principles and the deepest spirituality side by side with very practical attention to detail; in other words, he never tells us what to do without telling us at the same time how to do it.

Père Lebrun begins his study of the Saint's doctrine with its fundamental principle: devotion to the Person of our Blessed Lord. This, says St. John, is the natural way, the way in which God intended that we should adore the Blessed Trinity.

"To adore and to glorify Jesus," writes St. John "is to adore and to glorify the Father and the Holy Ghost. To offer to Jesus all the glory rendered to Him in heaven and on earth is to offer this same glory to the Father and to the Holy Ghost" (p. 52).

In these few lines we notice already the sound basis of dogma on which the teachings of the French school rest.

But St. John is at pains always to make this teaching more practical and comprehensive. As Père Lebrun points out, it is not enough for him to say that Christ must be adored: he proceeds at once to show us how

and in what precisely we must adore Him. Our Lord, he says, is supremely adorable "for all that He is and for all that He does" both with regard to the Blessed Trinity and with regard to all creatures. We ought to glorify Him, continues St. John,

"in all His words, thoughts, deeds and sufferings, in all His virtues and in everything that is in Him, the smallest of which is so worthy of praise that though all the angels and saints are occupied throughout eternity in praising and glorifying it . . . they cannot give it the glory it deserves" (p. 53).

Cardinal de Bérulle had already put forward this teaching in explanation of the purpose of a Feast of Jesus which he had instituted, but St. John went further than this and arranged that all the mysteries of our Lord's life should be honoured at appropriate times during the Church's year. Thus, he says:

"We should leave nothing in Jesus to which we do not render some particular honour. In this way we should consider and honour Him everywhere, at all times and in all things" (p. 57).

There is no doubt, however, that among the virtues of our Lord there were some to which the Saint had a very special devotion, and those which inspired him most were the virtues, so beautiful to contemplate and so difficult to acquire, of humility, patience, simplicity and obedience. Hence it is that he loves most to dwell upon the mysteries of Christ's Passion, His Childhood, and the Blessed Eucharist. Out of his meditations on these, and with the inspiration of God, was born his great devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Practical as always and faithful to the traditions of his school, he took care to place it on a sound theological basis, but the motive and the heart of the devotion was a deep personal love of the Heart of our Lord, which he regarded as

"filled with infinite love for the Holy Trinity and inconceivable charity for mankind" (p. 63).

For St. John Eudes, Père Lebrun tells us:

"the feast of the Heart of Jesus was the feast of charity, as is plainly shown . . . in the Mass and Office" (which the Saint composed). "*Cor meum caritas est*"; runs the

antiphon at Vespers; "qui manet in caritate in Corde meo manet et Cor meum manet in eo" (p. 65).

The piety of St. John reaches its greatest heights when he is treating, as he does at great length, of the love of Jesus for us, but he is swift to appreciate the consequence to those who accept it: they

"have nothing of themselves, any more than have slaves, and have no right to make any use of themselves . . . of their lives, their time or of the temporal goods they may possess, save only for Jesus Christ and for His members who are all those who believe in Him" (p. 70).

It will be seen from these words that there is something beautifully ruthless about the way in which the saint follows his principles to their logical conclusion. As we shall see, he realizes this himself and half apologizes for it, but he shows that such an attitude is inevitable in anyone who proposes to take his spiritual life really seriously.

Closely associated with his devotion to the Word Incarnate is the Saint's most tender devotion to the Mother of God. With regard to our Lady, he taught that as she was so closely united to her divine Son in life, she must never be separated from Him in our devotions.

"Jesus and Mary," he writes, "are so closely connected that he who sees Jesus sees Mary, he who loves Jesus loves Mary, he who has devotion to Jesus has devotion to Mary" (pp. 73-74).

A point upon which St. John insists is that while our Lady is worthy of the highest praise, she owes everything to Jesus and therefore all her glory is really His glory.

"To honour Mary as God asks of us and she desires," he says, "we must look on and adore her Son in her and see and adore therein none but Him. For that is how she wishes to be honoured since of herself, and by herself, she is nothing, but Jesus is everything in her: He is her being, her life, her holiness, her glory, her power and her greatness" (p. 76).

When he wrote these words, St. John might almost have had in mind the Protestant objections to our devotion to Mary, but whether this was so or not, it

is certain that these objections appear very foolish and irrelevant in the light of his sublime teaching.

Here again, however, Père Lebrun shows that the mind of the Saint moves inevitably from the fact of our Lady's excellence to its consequences in our own lives. If devotion to Jesus and Mary must not be separated, and if to honour Mary is to honour Jesus, then it follows that St. John's teaching implies nothing less than an entire consecration of our lives and our actions to our Lady, and through her to Christ.

And as with our Lady so it must be also with the saints and angels: the centre and the source of our devotion to them must always be Jesus Himself:

"To honour the saints as they should be honoured, we should adore Jesus in them; for He is everything in them: He is their glory, their life, their sanctity. We must thank Him for the glory and the praise that He renders Himself in them and by them. . . . We must offer Him all the honour and love that His saints give Him, and pray Him to make us sharers in this same love and in all their other virtues" (p. 83).

Here again, we feel, is the complete answer to the questions of non-Catholics regarding our veneration of the Saints. But our devotion to the saints must bear fruit in a real and sustained attempt to associate with theirs our own efforts to give honour and glory to Christ. We must offer to the saints our sincere gratitude for their actions and their lives, and honestly try to imitate them, always asking for their assistance.

As an example both of the beauty and consistence of St. John's teaching and of his practical attention to detail, Père Lebrun quotes some of his remarks on the subject of relics:

"We ought to consider and honour relics of the saints as a portion of Jesus and part of His members, and should carry them with us in union with the love which He bears all the Saints of all eternity in His Bosom and in His Heart, thereby uniting us with the love and the praises rendered to Him by those saints whose relics we carry, and which will be rendered by them eternally" (p. 84).

This is not a pious fancy: it is simply the logical conclusion to be drawn from the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, just another perfect little part of the

structure of St. John's spiritual life. And once again his ascetical teaching shows itself to be of no small value to the apologist, who could hardly find a more magnificent vindication of the practice of venerating relics than that which we have quoted above.

Thus St. John teaches us that the central object of all our devotion is our Blessed Lord, first in all that He is and does Himself, then in His Mother and in the saints and angels. Finally we should honour and glorify Him in our own persons and in the person of our neighbour.

This is familiar doctrine to us all, but it seems to acquire a new force in the words of the Saint:

"Look upon your neighbour as . . . the temple of the living God, bearing in himself the image of the most Holy Trinity and the character of Jesus Christ, bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh. Look upon him as he for whom Christ so laboured, so suffered, and gave His blood and His life; and also look upon him as one whom Christ commends to you as though he were Christ himself, assuring you that what you do to the least of these. . . . He will consider as done to Himself" (p. 84).

Such words as these on the love we should show to our neighbour are what we should expect from one so consumed with the love of God as St. John Eudes.

From a consideration of St. John's teaching on devotion to our Divine Lord, Père Lebrun passes on to his characteristic doctrine on the life of Jesus within us. This expression is itself very significant, because, as St. John is never tired of repeating, the spiritual life of the disciple of Christ is nothing else than the continuation of the very life of his Master.

True to the doctrine of the French school, St. John shows us our Lord as the source of life and grace Who alone can "deliver us from the body of this death"; Who "came that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly"; Who is the vine of which we are the branches; apart from Whom there is only decay and spiritual death; and "of whose fullness we have all received." So, when speaking of our spiritual life, St. John always prefers to call it not our life but "the life of Jesus in Christian souls," because.

"Christians are only on earth for the purpose of con-

tinuing thereon the most holy life that Jesus once led there, and because the chief business of a Christian must be to labour to form and establish Jesus within himself " (p. 88).

In support of this teaching, the saint appeals to St. Paul and his doctrine on the mystical body of Christ, according to which the Church reproduces daily in its members the mysteries of the life of Jesus; so that "bearing and glorifying God in our bodies" it is no longer we who suffer and rejoice, are humiliated and exalted, but Christ who does and suffers these things within us. Our sanctification, therefore, is the sanctification of Jesus in us and its motive is the glory of God. So that in very truth it is no longer we who live but Christ who liveth in us.

In order to make this more clear, Père Lebrun proceeds to a review of the Saint's teaching with regard to Baptism, because it is by the Sacrament of Baptism that we are incorporated into Christ's mystical body, from which act of incorporation all these effects follow.

To St. John Eudes the chief thing about baptism apart from its sacramental character is that it is a definite bilateral contract, a contract by which we enter into a union with Christ which is so intimate that it can only be compared to the union which exists between Christ and His Father. From this union arise consequences of the greatest importance which he deals with at length and of which he enumerates five:

"That our Lord stands to you as the head to its members so that everything in Him is yours, His spirit, His heart, His body, His mind, and that you must make use of them as your own for the purpose of serving, praising, loving, and glorifying God."

"That you stand to Him as do the members to the head, for which reason He ardently desires to make use of all that is in you for the service and glory of His Father, as of things that are His own."

"That He desires all that is in Him to live and reign in you . . . in your heart . . . in the faculties of your soul . . . in your senses and in your passions."

"That outside Him there is only death and perdition for you . . . so that you must live only for Him, in Him and by Him."

"That you are one with this same Jesus . . . and that He Himself must be your mind, your heart, your love, your life, your all " (pp. 93-94).

Since, then, we are made one with Christ it follows that we are also admitted into the very life of the Blessed Trinity. Thus His Father becomes our Father and loves us with the same love with which He loved Christ. "Thou hast sent me," says Jesus, "and hast loved them as thou hast also loved me."

As Père Lebrun shows, this was a truth which gave the greatest joy and consolation to St. John Eudes, and which he incorporated into his Office of the Sacred Heart, quoting the beautiful words of Isaias :

"Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, all the remnant of the house of Israel, who are carried by my bowels, who are borne up by my womb. Even to your old age, I am the same, and to your grey hairs I will carry you. I have made you and I will bear : I will carry and will save" (Isaias xlv. 3-4).

Similarly His Holy Spirit becomes ours, His mother becomes our mother, and His saints our brethren. These unspeakable privileges become ours with baptism when we "put on Christ," and they are ours for all eternity.

But we, on our side, have our part of the contract to fulfil, and with baptism we assume the obligations which as adopted sons we owe to our Father. These obligations involve nothing less than renunciation of ourselves completely and entirely to God's will, nothing less than death to all our sinful desires and inclinations which frustrate the fulfilment of His will in us, a ceaseless and relentless war against that concupiscence, the recognition of which occupies so large a part in the saint's teaching.

"We must labour to annihilate ourselves, i.e., our own feelings, self-will, self-love, pride and vanity, all our perverse inclinations and habits, all the desires and instincts of our depraved nature, and everything that is of ourselves . . . everything must be destroyed and consumed so that Jesus Christ may perfectly live and reign within us" (p. 106).

As we have already noticed, St. John was well aware that such a doctrine might appear "a hard saying." He saw quite clearly that there is a finality about it which is rather fearful, and yet which cannot be logically evaded. He says :

"This death seems to be terrifying, this flaming sword

in the hand of the cherubim seems formidable, but its effect is very different from its appearance. For it is a sword of love, the sword that has wounded and slain all true lovers of Jesus, that is all the saints. It wounded them that it might heal them, it killed them to bring them to life; it made them die to sin, to the world, to themselves . . . so as to make them live with the life of God " (p. 107).

As usual, the Saint is not content to recommend renunciation in general terms, but proceeds to give us a method and examples of acts of resignation which must become habitual, because as he points out, renunciation is hard; it cuts across our strongest natural inclinations; it means doing constant violence to our own desires. It is, therefore, a virtue acquired only by constant and relentless exercise. One of the most beautiful of these acts, of which Père Lebrun quotes several, is the following:—

" O Jesus, Thou art the cherubim placed by God at the gate of the second Paradise; the flaming sword is in Thy hand. Strike, then, strike with that sword the old Adam, the man of sin and of perdition. . . . If this antichrist does not die in us, Thou canst not live within us O Jesus. . . . Slay him then, that Thou mayest live completely in us, that we may say with Thine apostle: ' I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me ' " (pp. 109-110).

This death unto sin is as it were the negative part of the obligation which we assume at baptism, but there is also a positive duty, the duty of consciously imitating our Lord in His virtues. We are now members of His body; we must therefore act " with His intentions and dispositions." But how can we do this? The best way, St. John thinks, is to cultivate the habit of placing ourselves before we act or speak in the position of Christ, and considering what He would do or say in the circumstances. This might not be easy at first, but it would become habitual with practice. In this way a very real union would be developed between our Lord and ourselves and we should be approaching very nearly to the ideal of St. Paul.

Père Lebrun concludes this section of his book by commenting upon the grandeur of the Saint's doctrine, and emphasizing his teaching that Jesus is not merely

" the Redeemer who has made satisfaction for our sins, and the God who has a right to our adoration; He is, in addition,

the Head whose life must be united to ours in order to cover our failings and to give us the perfection that will make us pleasing in the eyes of the Heavenly Father" (pp. 128-129).

As we should expect in his teaching on the kingdom of Jesus in the souls of Christians, St. John Eudes had important things to say about prayer, which he calls:

"A respectful and loving elevation of the mind and heart to God; a sweet and holy communication of the Christian soul with its God" (p. 132).

Like everything else prayer has its proper setting in the scheme of St. John's doctrine; it is not something apart but

"a participation in the life of the angels and saints, in the life of Jesus and His most holy Mother, and even in the life . . . of the three Divine Persons" (p. 133).

Since also man is on earth only to continue the life which Jesus led here, then his prayers are but part of the prayer of Christ.

Although he does not overlook the need of prayers of petition, it is clear from Père Lebrun's study that St. John regards them only as a part of something which is itself much more exalted, something which is no less than union with the life of the Blessed Trinity. The fact is that this is really all that man exists for, and unless he achieves this, he has failed to reach the one end for which he was created. So that prayer is in reality

"the true and proper function of a man and of a Christian, for man is created only for God, and for union with Him."

Mental prayer he regards as of paramount importance and he has some very definite teaching on the lines which it should follow. In this connection as in everything else, our Lord Himself is the beginning, the centre, and the end of our devotion. Nor, says Père Lebrun:

"Would he have us limit ourselves in our prayers to considering in themselves the Christian virtues, the evangelical truths, or the examples of the saints, but he wants us always to consider them in their relations with the Incarnate Word" (p. 140).

Mental prayer, too, must not begin and end with the

intellect, but it must move the will to love and imitate Him in Whom the mind delights.

In this connection, too, St. John wishes to impress upon his readers the justice of God's claims upon us: God has been so infinitely generous to us, His Providence is so concerned over the smallest details of our lives, that the least we can do in return—and that, it would seem, we are bound in justice to do—is to give to Him without reserve all that we have and all that we are. We ought, therefore, says St. John, to meditate upon the acts and the life of our Lord if only because God has meditated so lovingly upon each one of us:

“ If the Son of God takes the trouble to give His mind and His heart (which, it would seem, should take note only of what is divine) to considering and counting our every step, and even the hairs of our heads; . . . and if He writes in His heart and preserves as treasures the least actions that we perform for Him, so as to honour and glorify them for ever in heaven: with what care should we apply our minds and hearts to considering, adoring and glorifying the smallest occurrences in His life and mysteries, since there is nothing in these that is not infinitely great and admirable, and which does not deserve infinite honour and adoration ” (pp. 145-146).

Having thus given us such a lofty motive and such a sublime object for our meditation, St. John in accordance with his usual practice proceeds at once to show us how to do it. He puts forward a very simple scheme of which Père Lebrun gives a lucid summary, a method which is easy because it is so natural, and because it is in harmony with all St. John's teaching. Our Lord as always is the central figure of each meditation and around Him are grouped our Lady, His saints, and, last, but by no means least, ourselves,

“ For we have a quite special part in every one of our Lord's mysteries, inasmuch as in each of them the Son of God had some idea, some plan, or some particular aspect of His love to reveal for each of us ” (p. 147).

In the section of his book on Prayer, Père Lebrun gives us the Saint's teaching on the divine office, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, examination of conscience, and what he calls “ the habit of prayer.” It is sufficient to notice here that in them all he brings out the extremely practical nature of St. John's work, and

its all-pervading motive: the glory of our Lord. As an example of this we notice that even in our examination of conscience, when we might expect at least to be pre-occupied for a time with ourselves, it is Jesus again and not ourselves Who must still fill our minds:

"Let us adore our Lord Jesus Christ as our sovereign judge and submit ourselves to His power of judging us. Let us adore and bless Him in the judgment that He exercises: . . . and let us beg Him to make us sharers in the light by which He will make us see our sins, and in His divine justice, so that we may know and detest the sins we have this day committed" (p. 163).

Thus should we begin our examination of conscience; thus in all things should we labour to give our Lord the honour due to Him, to lose our own interests in His, and all this out of pure love for Him.

We see this again even more clearly in the pages which deal with St. John's teaching on the Christian virtues. He laments the fact that so few really acquire virtue while so many strive after it. The reason is, he says, because they look on virtue "simply with the eyes of human reason"; they believe that they can acquire it by their own efforts, and they seek it not for God's glory but for their own. Such efforts are doomed inevitably to fruitlessness, because virtue must be sought only

"in Jesus who is the source of all grace, Who eminently and in a sovereign degree possesses every kind of virtue. and in Whom virtue is of infinite worth" (p. 172).

Moreover, virtue must be cultivated only for the glory of our Lord and never for our own exaltation;

"for just as the Christian life is nothing else but a continuation of the life of Christ, so, too, Christian virtues are a continuation and completion of His virtues. And if virtues are to be put into practice in a Christian manner, it must be in the spirit in which Jesus practised them, and with the motives and intentions that were His" (p. 175).

It is on this foundation that St. John works out the practical method of acquiring the virtues in all their perfection, which method Père Lebrun gives us in his book. The Saint's doctrine is perhaps not an easy one to put into practice; "a harsh saint" he was called, for though he was in himself a model of kindness to

all those with whom he came into contact, yet, as Père Lebrun writes :

“ with souls of goodwill he never hesitated to put forward Christian doctrine in its loftiest and most austere aspect; and what he preached to others he was himself the first to put into practice ” (p. 223).

One of the greatest aims of St. John Eudes was to build up an educated and sanctified clergy, and the author devotes the last section of his book to St. John's teaching on the Priesthood. Here we can only say that he can scarcely find words to express the exaltation of the state of the Christian priest, for in the functions of the priest, he sees, says Père Lebrun, “ a sort of participation in the noblest operations of the three Divine Persons.” If the Christian life is simply the life of Jesus in our souls, then the priest's life must be this *par excellence*. How shall he describe the intimacy that exists between Christ, the great High Priest, and those who share His very priesthood on earth?

“ You are His eyes, because it is by you that this Good Shepherd watches over His flock. . . . You are His mouth and His tongue for by you He speaks to men and continues to preach the same Gospel as He Himself preached while yet upon earth. You are His heart, for it is by you that He gives true life, the life of grace upon earth, and the life of glory in heaven ” (p. 232).

Thus there is only one degree of sanctity for the priest to strive after: the very sanctity of Christ, Whose life he is bound to imitate and, as the Saint teaches, to continue, in his constant prayer and his ceaseless activity and zeal for souls.

It seems to the writer that the English translation of Père Lebrun's book has appeared at a most opportune time. The field of apologetics is constantly shifting: at one time, “ it is the Mass that matters,” at another time it is the Pope. This is a rough way of expressing the fact that during the centuries, Catholic apologists have had to rally now around one dogma, now around another in order to combat successive heresies and make clear the truth of the Church's teaching. In England we Catholics, and more especially our priests, have long

become accustomed to dealing patiently with the well-known difficulties of Protestants: the confessional; the invocation of our Lady and the saints; the real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist: in short all those doctrines which Protestants rejected after the Reformation. But it is being gradually borne upon us that England to-day is becoming less Protestant as it becomes more pagan. The difficulties of the Protestant are giving place to the much greater and more ancient difficulties of the pagan. The skirmish between Catholic and Protestant on the battleground of Infallibility is being dwarfed into insignificance by the new outburst of the ancient warfare between Catholic and pagan: the struggle, with St. Paul in the vanguard, on behalf of Christ's divinity; to many still a stumbling block; to many more, still mere foolishness.

Here, then, is our task: to show the world Christ its Saviour and true God, and to do this we must first possess Him ourselves. St. John Eudes shows us the way. Speaking of his book, *Le Royaume de Jésus*, Père de Jaegher, S.J., says:

"If this magnificent teaching were better known, if this book were in the hands of those who direct souls towards the loftiest form of divine union . . . then undoubtedly many souls would be raised higher . . . who now can only vegetate in mediocrity" (p. 16).

The same might be said of Père Lebrun's book.

HOMILETICS

BY THE RIGHT REV. MGR. DEAN, D.D., Ph.D.

First Sunday of Lent.

MAN'S SUPERNATURAL EQUIPMENT.

"We exhort you that you receive not the grace of God in vain."

- I. (1) Man, great in the order of nature,
(2) Is crowned with glory in the order of grace.
- II. The two orders not utterly disparate : comparison profitable.
- III. Basis—grace perfects nature by qualifying it for higher things.
- IV. (1) Sanctifying grace perfects the essence of the soul.
(2) Theological virtues perfect the soul's faculties in their quest of man's last end.
(3) Moral virtues perfect the faculties in their quest of the means to the end.

I. (1) "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," and when on the sixth day He created man to His own image, with understanding and free-will, He created the masterpiece of all His works. Even in the order of nature, apart from grace and every supernatural and preternatural endowment, "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! . . . in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a god!"

(2) But man in the higher order of grace, man supernaturalized and "begotten anew," hallowed and elevated by "that justness which cometh from God," equipped with divinely-infused virtues and dowered with the seven-fold gift of the Spirit, is man "crowned with glory and honour," "a little lower than the angels," "a partaker of the divine nature," qualified for heaven, "the heir of God and joint-heir with Christ."

II. It is profitable to compare and contrast these two orders of nature and of grace. The second excels the first; but greater excellence is no proof of complete dissimilarity. In fact, it is a knowledge of the likeness and correspondence between the two orders which helps so much to a better appreciation of man's crowning glory, and to a fuller realization of the truth that God, who so loved His own in the order of nature, loved them indeed to the end, to the uttermost, in the order of grace.

III. The basic principle is that *grace perfects nature*. Whatever is supernatural in man is, as it were, superimposed or grafted upon what is natural in him. Grace does not uproot nature, destroy it, or utterly supplant it; nor does it transform

man into something no longer human. Rather, it qualifies nature for higher things, reinforces, elevates and ennobles it, purifying and quickening the inmost sources of human life and activity. We must never mistake the mere imagery of truth for the truth itself. Sanctifying grace, with its right noble retinue of infused virtues and its dowry of gifts, is not just an outer "wedding-garment" gemmed and jewelled; nor is it but "glory" and "light." No; St. Paul says, "the grace of God is *life*"; and the Church with still greater precision teaches that grace is a divine quality infused into the very soul of man. The virtues too, theological and moral, impart a new and higher vitality to the natural faculties of intellect and will; while the accompanying gifts of the Holy Spirit, as St. Thomas teaches, dispose the soul to be readily responsive to the promptings of the Spirit of God. Thus by the bestowal of grace "is the inner man renewed"; God breathes anew into the face of man, and man becomes indeed "a living soul," a superman not of blood nor of race, but of God and of grace.

IV. (1) *Sanctifying grace perfects the essence of the soul.* In the order of nature the immortal soul is the noblest element in man. It is God's own handiwork, coming straight from His hands. Above all, the soul is that which makes man *live*, and is the primal source in him of every form of human life and activity. When the soul quits the body, man is dead. In the supernatural order sanctifying grace is the counterpart of the soul, not merely because grace is the most ennobling element in man—it makes him a son of God—nor yet because it is God's own work and gift, but above all because it is that which makes man *live* with a new life, live supernaturally, and is the primal source of his abounding supernatural activity. If sin quench the life of grace, the supernatural man is dead, a son of God is no more. In the imagery of St. Paul, a competitor for the crown of life has become "disqualified."

(2) *The theological virtues perfect the understanding and the will in their quest of man's last end.* The goal of human endeavour is happiness, even perfect happiness. Man naturally makes for this with an irresistible, inborn, tendency. His God-like mind with unquenchable thirst, ranges the universe and discerns the good—this good, that good, other good, and ever the possibility of more good. His will, with insatiable appetite, follows up and fastens upon the findings of the mind and craves for more. The whole man, however vaguely aware of it, is really groping for God who alone is all-good and all-perfect. But the vision in its fullness is far beyond man's merely natural powers. "No man," saith St. John, "hath seen God"; "neither can see Him," adds St. Paul—certainly not "face to face," with His myriad unveiled perfections. In the order of nature, the most that man could perceive—whether in the body or out of the body—would be a dimly-mirrored Divinity with dimly-mirrored perfections, a God imaged and reflected in the *works* of His hands.

But in the supernatural order, grace again comes in to elevate and reinforce nature, and to carry the vision to its fullness and perfection. This is precisely the work of faith, hope, and charity. They perfect the intellect and the will; they have God alone as their objective. Fortified by the infusion of these new powers, man goes forth to find God attainable—knowable and lovable—in entirely new ways. By faith he now sees God, as God's own *words* reveal Him, in the mirror of "revelation," above all in the revelation of the uncreated Word Incarnate. By hope he soars above all created good, the confident claimant of a beatific vision superabounding in delights. By charity—"God is love"—already "he abideth in God and God abideth in him" Yet these are but the beginnings of grace. One day faith shall yield to sight, hope pass into perfect fruition, and charity become the eternal embrace of God.

(3) *The moral virtues perfect the faculties in their quest of the means to the end.* "To err is human." Even Adam, for all his added gifts, was not impeccable. Still less could man in the order of pure, ungifted, nature make unerringly for God. When reason fails to rule, the passions all run riot. Thoughtlessness, self-seeking, weakness, and sensuality withdraw both mind and heart from God. To reach the goal of life, then, man must take precautions, deny himself, have courage, and check his passions—not just fitfully but habitually; in a word, he must acquire moral virtue—the habit of conducting himself aright. We say "acquire," for moral virtue is not a man's natural birthright. But in the order of grace God comes mightily to man's assistance by the generous and gratuitous infusion of the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance, supported by so many ministering virtues—humility, obedience, patience, purity, etc.—that every son of God may justly stand amazed at his own unmerited blessedness. He has life and has it abundantly; and this "not now by works, else grace were grace no more." Man's own part is so to use the power conferred as to acquire facility in the use thereof and to merit the fullness of life everlasting. See then "that you receive not the grace of God in vain."

Second Sunday of Lent.

SANCTIFYING GRACE.

"This is the will of God, your sanctification."

1. Scripture speaks of a recreation, regeneration, newness of life, participation in divine nature. Man becomes the child and heir of God.
2. The Church upholds the language of Scripture and unfolds the nature and power of grace.
3. The Beatific Vision the key to the mysteries of grace: joint-heirship with Christ involves man's supernaturalization.
4. The language of Scripture found to be justified.

1. Doubtless most of us were, by the mercy of God, sanctified soon after birth. We were brought to the church for baptism, and when we came forth again—we have it on the authority of God and must hold fast to His words—we were “new creatures,” for we had been re-created. We were “children of God,” for we had been “born again,” “begotten anew,” “not of blood” this time, “but of God.” We then and there began to live “in newness of life,” with a life that was new and “everlasting,” as real and of its own nature as durable as the life our parents had given us; for we had been endowed with a new vital principle whereby to live, and live for ever, the life of sons of God. In the vivid words of St. Peter, we had become “partakers of the divine nature”—an amazing supernaturalization—capable of a higher, even of a divine, form of activity.

When they bore us back from the font, our parents claimed us—doubtless more lovingly—as their own children. But, indeed, we were far less theirs than God’s. He had given us more than they. Thenceforth heaven, not earth, was our real home. God forbid that we should ever barter our new birth-right for all the kingdoms of the world! We are waiting now, with firm faith and steadfast hope, for our Saviour to utter our own “*consummatum est*” and to gather us to Himself, as “joint-heirs” with Him in the joy of the Beatific Vision.

2. Never, perhaps, has the divinely-guided genius of the Church shone forth so brilliantly as when she took up the task of interpreting those seemingly incredible expressions and implications of Holy Writ—“new creature,” “new birth,” “new life,” “new nature,” even “divine nature”—and while justifying their perfect truth, for God had meant what He had said, she taught us in simple, crisp, clear language, that what we had received in baptism was sanctifying grace, and that this grace was a divine quality divinely infused into our souls. In virtue of this divine qualification we became “new creatures” without losing our identity; we were “reborn” without ceasing to live; we received a “new life” without acquiring a new soul, and became “partakers of the divine nature” without ceasing to be human.

3. There is but one key to the manifold mysteries of our sanctification, and St. Paul points to it with the words: “We are the sons of God. And if sons, heirs also; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ . . . that with Him we may also be glorified.” To be the heir of God is to be entitled to live with God the life of God, in God’s own home, sharing the same happiness wherewith God Himself is happy.

Now God’s essential activity and happiness consist in the contemplation and enjoyment of His own divine essence with its infinite perfections; “And for such things who is sufficient?” No man naturally can see and know and love God as He sees and knows and loves Himself. God’s Being, God’s Life, God’s

Mind, God's Love—these are identical and one with His Divine essence. The feeble, finite faculties of the human soul are of their very nature utterly unequal to such an Act of contemplation and love. Yet we have God's word for it—that “we shall see Him as He is,” “face to face.” Therefore must we be supernaturalized; our natural incapacity must be countered, overcome, and transcended. The soul and its faculties must be divinely endowed with “newness of life” and strength. And this is precisely the work of sanctifying grace—to qualify us for the Beatific Vision. Thus “made free from sin, ye have your fruit in sanctification, and for end life everlasting. For the wages of sin is death, but the grace of God life everlasting in Christ Jesus.”

The whole doctrine of man's sanctification is summed up in the powerful statement of St. Paul to Titus: “When the goodness and kindness of God our Saviour appeared, He saved us, out of His mercy, with the (baptismal) laver of regeneration and renovation by the Holy Spirit, whom He hath poured forth upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ, that justified by His grace we might become in hope heirs of everlasting life.”

4. Now, indeed, we see, faintly at least, how—if God in His goodness, by the infusion of grace, shall so lift us above our inborn capacity as to enable us to do what He alone by nature can do—we can truly be said to share in God's activity, to be deified, to have become “partakers of the divine nature.” And we begin to realize how—if God, who did so wonderfully create and ennoble our being, has still more wonderfully renewed it, “transforming us into His very image from glory to glory”—we are indeed become new beings, “new creatures,” made like unto the supreme Being. And we understand how—if Jesus came to men already alive that nevertheless “they might have life and have it abundantly”—there must be a “new life” by which men must live even now, some great grace or “gift of God” that shall be in them as “a fountain of water springing up unto life everlasting.” And, lastly, we see why, if we are one day to inherit life everlasting in all its fullness and to share the very life of God and of God's co-equal Son, “we should be called and should be the sons of God,” “reborn of water and the Holy Ghost,” “begotten of God,” “heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.”

O inestimable sacraments, that give us grace, strengthen it, nourish it, restore it, and perfect it! Truly, *this is the will of God, your sanctification.*

Third Sunday of Lent.

LOSS OF SANCTIFYING GRACE.

“He that is not with Me is against Me.”

1. The sole cause of loss and what it involves.
2. Sanctifying grace of its own nature everlasting: the destructive power of sin.

3. Loss of grace means loss of power to see God as He is, face to face.
4. The loss an appalling calamity.

1. Sanctifying grace is lost only by mortal sin. They are incompatible. We cannot be at the same time light and darkness, friends and foes of God. We cannot abide in His love and forsake Him, reject our inheritance and cling to the title-deeds, take our own life and still live on. "The wages of sin is death, but the grace of God life everlasting." With grace and charity depart the infused moral virtues and the sevenfold gift of the Holy Ghost. We lose all—save, perhaps, faith and hope. These, now limp and lifeless, usually linger on, by the mercy of God, who will have us still believe and hope even if we will not love, and who desires not the eternal death of the sinner, but that he turn from his way and live.

2. The destructive power of sin is revealed by the fact that sanctifying grace of its own nature is everlasting. St. John repeatedly calls it "life everlasting," not meaning thereby the eternal bliss of heaven, but the vital principle itself by which we live as sons of God both here and hereafter: "I write that ye may know that ye *have* life everlasting." He writes, then, of something already possessed, which abides for ever, an unfailing fount of life, the new life which his readers had received in baptism. With all the eagerness of a divine longing to make us His sons for ever, God has given to us also in baptism the very life by which He intends us to live for all eternity. The full significance of "keeping one's baptismal innocence" is now apparent, as is also the malice of extinguishing God's priceless gift of heavenly life by the spiritual suicide of mortal sin.

3. Moreover, so to act is to make the attainment of one's last end an utter impossibility—unless by a miracle of mercy God shall raise the dead to life. We know that creation, redemption, and sanctification sum up the manifold favours of the most Holy Trinity. Yet they are but means to an end, and that end is the supreme, ultimate, and everlasting blessing of the Beatific Vision. One thing only can wreck God's loving designs—our lack of sanctifying grace. Without this no man can see God "as He is," or know Him fully. In fact, such vision is beyond the purely natural capacity of any created or creatable being. It is a truth to be realized—the utter powerlessness of the human soul, whether of a babe never baptized or of a man who has fallen from grace, to stand thus "graceless" or "disgraced" before God and with feeble, fumbling, purblind faculties to see God as God sees Himself.

Men are apt to think that lack of purity rather than lack of power disqualifies them for the Beatific Vision. Venial sin, indeed, retards the Vision; but purgatory can and does make good this lack of purity, never the lack of power. Even the perfect human soul of our God Incarnate, untouched by sin original or actual, was, without grace, incapable of that Beatific

Vision which it ever enjoyed from the moment of the Incarnation. While, then, it is true that "nothing defiled shall enter heaven," it is also true that the soul and its faculties must be divinely reinforced, so supernaturalized that man becomes deified—gifted with a capacity to share in God's own life and activity. Hence loss of grace is not only loss of spiritual comeliness and splendour, but is also loss of power, of a vital force essential to the Beatific Vision.

4. From all this we shall readily infer that the wilful loss of sanctifying grace by grievous sin is man's supreme act of folly, insolence and ingratitude. It is an appalling calamity the magnitude of which reason cannot realize and faith can but dimly discern. We know that even in the order of nature one spiritual and immortal soul is grander far than myriads of material worlds. And perhaps we can visualize one such world in ruins. For the day shall come when "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken"; and when they crash, we shall realize then the wreck of a universe. More fearful is the wreck of a soul.

Faith will carry us further. When God created heaven and earth, "He spoke and they were made"; they cost Him only the breath of a fiat. But to re-create men's souls in grace, He suffered and bled and died; they cost Him His life. Has God not done His best? He could not have assigned to man a higher destiny than that of the Beatific Vision; He could not have made them partakers of a higher nature than the Divine Nature; He could not have raised them to a higher rank than that of sons of God; He could not have given them a higher life than the Divine Life. The whole history of the world is really the history of the efforts of God to accomplish "the purpose of His good pleasure" in man's regard. For this "He hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing: He singled us out, before the foundation of the world, to be holy and unspotted in His sight. In love He predestined us to be adopted as His sons, unto the praise of the glory of His grace" (Eph. i. 3-6). For this He created man, and crowned the father of our race with the glory and honour of His grace. For this, when Adam fell, He promised a Redeemer. For this were the Law and the Prophets, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the Mass. The day of our baptism was for God the birthday of a well-loved son, the chosen day of our regeneration, a day of fulfilment and promise alike, the day of our re-creation unto life everlasting. And then, perhaps—God help us!—we sinned grievously, mortally; we rose up against our Creator, Saviour, and Sanctifier, and uttered our defiance: "I will not serve!" And in that moment the soul was darkened, charity gave no more light, the stars of virtue fell from heaven, and the powers of heaven were shaken. A world of graces crashed to ruin. The awful might of sin triumphed over the loving, eternal, purpose of God. And the Father of souls cried out: "Hear, O ye heavens, and give

ear, O earth! I brought up children, and exalted them: and they have despised Me!"

These things saints, enlightened, have seen and have swooned in horror. God Incarnate saw them, and He fell into an agony; "and His sweat became as drops of blood falling down to the ground."

"Ye were heretofore darkness; but now light in the Lord. Walk, then, as children of the light."

Fourth Sunday of Lent.

OUR REAL FREEDOM.

With freedom Christ hath made us free. Stand fast, and be not held again under the yoke of bondage (Gal. iv. 31-v. 1).

1. Creation puts all in bondage to God. The gift of free-will does not release us; it gives the power, but not the right to sin.
2. Sin is servitude to a creature: so no escape from bondage: if not honourable, then vile.
3. Our real freedom is the liberty we have in Christ Jesus. Our right and power to go to God is due to the grace of Christ.

1. The two most important questions and answers in the Catechism are the first and second. The child that knows them holds the key of life. God, in view of our last end, has endowed us with understanding wherewith to know Him, and with free-will wherewith to love Him and elect of our own choice to serve Him and thus merit the happiness promised. This freedom of the will is the highest prerogative of human nature. But no sooner do we realize the sovereignty of the Giver and the high purpose of the gift, than we realize also that, though the gift imparts the *power* of choosing to sin rather than to serve, it confers no *right* to sin. Our very creation binds us indissolubly to God. We are all held fast in bondage, bound to God by the law of worship, the law of service, the law of love. For God made us and is therefore our Master and we are His servants. Every maker has the right to determine the use to which his handiwork shall be put, the service that shall be required of it. The Creator of all is over-ruled by none. He is bound by naught save His own unerring wisdom and His own infinite goodness. And if He has moulded us into "vessels of honour," more richly endowed than other creatures, to serve a more honourable and glorious purpose, has He therefore lesser claims upon us? Nay, higher gifts are given for higher service. We have, then, the *power*, but not the *right*, to tear the commandments to tatters; to degrade liberty to the level of licence; to assert our independence of every law, obligation, and duty; to defy God and go our own way. But freedom is made perfect in bondage—the bondage of free submission to the will and law of that Maker "whom to serve is to reign."

2. And if Him we will not serve, we shall but make for ourselves other gods—"strange gods" indeed!—a god of lust, or of gold, or of pleasure, or of passion. There is no escape from bondage. It is given to us to choose our own master—that is all. And our choice must be the honourable service of the Creator or vile servitude to the creature; "for by whatsoever thing a man is overcome, of the same is he the slave" (II Peter ii. 19). "Know ye not that ye are slaves of that which ye obey, either of sin unto death or of obedience unto justness" (Romans vi. 16). To the unsparing words of SS. Peter and Paul add the solemn pronouncement of Christ: "Amen, amen, I say to you, Everyone that committeth sin is a slave of sin" (John viii. 34). This is the tragedy of all time. Men cry: "Liberty, liberty," "we will not serve"—and rush at once into servitude! They claim their freedom, and thrust their feet into fetters, their hands into shackles, "yielding their members to serve uncleanness and iniquity, unto iniquity," goaded on by those evil forces ever at work in man—"the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." Every passion in the human breast can muster a host of slaves. Men who have conquered kingdoms have never mastered themselves. "Promising liberty, themselves are the slaves of corruption" (II Peter ii. 19). There is but one bondage wholly honourable, worthy of man, and consummated in glory: it is the bondage of men "freed from sin and enslaved to God, who have their fruit in sanctification, and for end life everlasting" (Romans vi. 22).

3. If, then, we are either "slaves to justness" or "slaves to iniquity," where is the liberty of the children of God? St. Paul has given us the answer: "With freedom Christ hath made us free"; "we have our liberty in Christ Jesus" (Gal. ii. 4). Yea, Jesus Himself has told us: "If the Son (of God) shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John viii. 36). "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the house of bondage." We know something of our nature—how it weighs us down when we would rise to higher things. "The good which I will, I do not; the evil I will not, that I do." We bear in our breasts a score of passions all ready to riot against reason and break the resistance of the will. Human nature was made that way. When sin entered, sin reigned, and the last state of man became worse than the first. More blind was he, more feeble, more perverse. But out of the depths of the deepest instincts of his nature he cried for a Saviour, for light to see and know God better, for a way whereby to reach Him, for strength to walk therein. And God remembered the work of His hands and sent His Son, "the Way and the Truth and the Life." "Where sin abounded, grace did more abound," "grace wherein we stand and exult in the hope of the glory of the sons of God." For grace has supernaturalized us: grace means re-creation, regeneration, newness of life; grace brings us faith—new vision to the mind, hope—new strength to the will, charity—new life to the soul. It brings the forces of moral

virtue to counter the power of passion. It crowns all with the seven-fold gift of the Spirit, and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," "the liberty of the glory of the children of God." This is indeed our real freedom—the right and the power to go to God, our first beginning and our last end. "Thanks be to God who hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. xv. 57). "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, because He hath raised up for us the horn of salvation (the mighty Saviour), that delivered from the hand of our enemies we may serve without fear, in holiness and justness before Him, all our days." *With freedom Christ hath made us free. Stand fast, and be not held again under the yoke of bondage.*

Fifth Sunday of Lent.

THE ONE MEDIATOR.

"God will have all men to be saved and to come to knowledge of truth. For there is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a redemption for all (1 Tim. ii. 5-6).

1. Our creation—our fall—our losses.
2. Our redemption in Christ Jesus, "through the cross."
3. The office of a mediator: the human, and the divine.
4. Where the analogy breaks down: the perfect fitness of the one divine and human Mediator.
5. Summary and conclusion: Mary redeemed.

1. St. Paul's proof that God desires the salvation of *all* is that there is one God of *all*—one beneficent Creator of *all*, and one Mediator and Redeemer of *all*, who took our common nature and died for *all*. Our creation by the Father, our re-creation by the Son, and our sanctification by the Holy Ghost make up the sum of God's love and mercy.

When, in the beginning, God created man, He also crowned him with a glory and an honour to which he had by nature no shadow of title—the supernatural glory of the order of grace, the divine honour of sonship by adoption. Man's destiny was the highest possible—to live with God the life of God, sharing for ever the beatitude of God in the act of the Beatific Vision. Who shall say that God in His love did not wish man well?

Before we have well realized the God-given glories of our unfallen nature, we are filled of a sudden with the shame of our fall, and with fear of what now awaits us. For himself and for all, Adam forfeited all—grace, virtues, gifts—all the rights and glories of his supernatural estate, and more. One deprivation God spared our race: our supernal destiny still held good. God left us the hope of heaven. Who, then, shall say that God, in mercy now, did not still wish man well? But in sin are we all conceived, "grace-less," wounded and weakened in reason and will. We are born incapable of a single supernatural act,

of meriting life everlasting. We are left with a legacy of guilt, estrangement, and debt. We enter the world not children of God but "children of wrath," "enemies of God," "dead in sin."

2. But if love divine abounded in creation, and mercy at our fall, both love and mercy did superabound in our redemption. The barest statement of the truth is startling enough to unfamiliar ears: "When the fullness of time came *God sent forth His Son . . .* that we might (again) enter upon our adoption as sons" (Gal. iv. 4-5). But St. Paul was deeply moved when he wrote: "We were by nature children of wrath. But God, who is rich in mercy, by reason of His great love wherewith He hath loved us, even when we were dead in our transgressions brought us to life with Christ—by grace ye are saved—and raised us up and seated us with Christ Jesus in the heavenly places, to show in the ages to come the surpassing riches of His grace through His kindness to us in Christ Jesus. . . . In Him ye are brought near through the blood of Christ . . . through the cross . . . for through Him we have access to the Father" (Eph. ii. 3-18).

3. This repeated "through" expresses Christ's mission and ministry of mediation. Let us look at it closely. The office of a mediator is largely that of a peacemaker, whose aim it is to bring the estranged together, to open up avenues of approach, to reconcile enemies and make friends out of foes. He must break down barriers, secure reparation, press for atonement, and plead for forgiveness. And thus, indeed, did Christ Jesus mediate between God and man. "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God *through* the death of His Son" (Romans v. 10). "*Through* Him we have access to the Father" (Eph. ii. 18). "It hath pleased the Father *through* His beloved Son to reconcile all things to Himself . . . making peace *through* the blood of His cross. And whereas ye were at one time alienated and at enmity . . . yet now Christ hath reconciled you *through* His death" (Col. i. 19-20). "And therefore is He the Mediator of a new testament, that *by means of* His death . . . they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Heb. ix. 15).

4. Amongst ourselves it commonly happens that the mediator best qualified to restore harmony is one who is himself not involved in the quarrel, in no way identified with either party, with nothing to gain or to lose by the issue, but who stands aloof, distant and dispassionate, not leaning to right or to left. But here the analogy between the divine and the human mediator breaks down completely. In the Person of the God-man, Jesus Christ, God and man came together in the Incarnation in the new and everlasting and personal embrace of the Hypostatic Union, the most perfect and indissoluble bond of union possible between the divine and the human. Thus, as God-man, Jesus unutterably identified Himself with the cause of both. Yet who so fit as He to stand forth as the

perfect Mediator—acceptable, irresistible, adequate—between God offended and man the offender? In His divine nature He was the equal in majesty of the Father offended; in His human nature—the sinless and pleasing representative of man the offender, His every act the act of a divine Person and therefore of infinite worth. When, then, God ordained, as the supreme condition of peace, that the Mediator should humble Himself for the world He represented, by obedience unto death, yea, unto death upon a cross, He in Whom the Father was well pleased at once took up and completely “blotted out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, nailing it to the cross” (Col. ii. 14); and Calvary became the scene of the signing of a new and eternal covenant between God and man.

5. This, then, was Christ’s mediation, the divinely-appointed means of man’s redemption. Upon Jesus, not as guilty in His own person but as our representative and head, “the Lord laid the iniquity of us all” (Isai. liii. 6): “Him that knew not sin, for our sakes He made sin (by imputation), that in Him we might become the justness of God” (II. Cor. v. 21). By obedience unto death upon a cross, the Mediator *atoned* for sin and met to the full the divine demand for fullest reparation, and *merited* fully—yea, superabundantly—the favour and grace of God for men. And *the fruit* of this redemption was our *deliverance* from the servitude of sin, and our *restoration* to the order of grace with all its rights and privileges. Thus was Christ the one Mediator of salvation for all, who gave Himself a ransom for all in place of all—“for all,” even for most holy Mary, His mother, herself the choicest flower and fruit of her Son’s redemption, of all the children of men the most gloriously redeemed!

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE VERY REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

In his preface to the nineteenth edition of Davidson's *Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, the late Professor J. E. McFadyen writes: "The all but universal repugnance to the study of the language is explained partly by the fact that it is begun later in life than other languages, at a time when men's minds are less responsive to, and more intolerant of, a new and unfamiliar discipline; but it is also due in part to the mistaken idea that its principles are intricate and haphazard. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I have sought to leave upon the reader's mind the conviction of the essential simplicity and regularity of the language."¹ Few teachers of Hebrew, it may be claimed, were better qualified than Professor McFadyen to discuss the fundamentals of the language simply and attractively, and the publication in 1924 of his *Key to the Exercises in Davidson's Hebrew Grammar*, with copious explanatory notes, made self-instruction in the writing of tolerable Hebrew prose a relatively easy matter. Yet, when all has been said, a good deal remains to be done if Hebrew grammar is ever to be made a popular subject, and the first ten sections of McFadyen's edition of Davidson, which are of primary importance for the comprehension of what follows, undeniably make stiff reading. Given that, as the Professor wrote in the same preface: "There is doubtless an inevitable amount of drudgery in the study of any language," it may still be asked whether anything has been done in the twenty years that have elapsed since he first made his revision of Davidson, to reduce that drudgery to an ineluctable minimum.

Some answer to this question has recently been provided by the publication of a course of exercises in Hebrew conversation which, while it admittedly deals with modern Hebrew and not directly with the principal language of the Old Testament, is likely to be of real service to a beginner in establishing ready contact with the language. There will always be some dispute as to the exact value of the direct method of language study, but few will deny that the ability to follow a conversation in a language is a notable assistance to one who is striving to think in the language and to pronounce it as accurately as possible. Hebrew is not an easy language to pronounce; as compared with Arabic, the other great Semitic language which is still widely used as a conversational medium, it is, in the judgment of many, the more difficult of the two. And, while nothing will dispense the student from a painstaking study of

¹ Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 22nd edition. 1923. p. x.

grammars, dictionaries and commentaries, there is in any language a certain "song" or rhythm which must be acquired, directly or indirectly, from native speakers.

The course is entitled *The Linguaphone Conversational Course in Modern Hebrew* and has been prepared in collaboration with Dr. David Yellin of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Dr. Ernst Simon of the Reale School, Haifa, and Mr. I. Wartski, Lecturer in Modern Hebrew at the University of London School of Oriental Studies. The text-books are two small cloth-bound volumes, one of which gives the full Hebrew text of the exercises. The other contains the English key to the exercises with some introductory remarks on an approach to spoken Hebrew.²

It is possible to obtain these volumes separately, but they are primarily intended for use with a series of twelve ten-inch double-sided records which have been prepared for the Linguaphone Institute by three practised speakers of modern Hebrew, Dr. David Yellin, Mr. Joseph Yahuda and Miss Dina Chaikin. The first record gives, on one side, the Hebrew consonantal and vowel sounds with the *sheva* and its composites and furtive *pathah*; on the reverse, the pronunciation of select names of famous men and women, cities in Palestine, and villages and collective farms. Records 2-11 present a series of forty lessons, mostly exercises in conversation, which deal with such subjects as nationalities and languages, the political and social organization of Palestine, the Palestinian Press, business correspondence and so forth. Lesson 38 is an address by Dr. Yellin on the Hebrew revival, and lessons 39-40 consist of a reading by two voices of the Hebrew poet Bialik's verses, "The Blessing of the People." The twelfth and last record (Lessons 41-44) gives readings from the Hebrew Bible, in which magnificent extracts from Isaias, Jeremias, Job, Micheas, II Kings, and the Pentateuch are sonorously declaimed. There can be no doubt, I think, that the recording has been excellently done, and for English speaking students it is an advantage that the pronunciation used is Sephardic, which is the system followed by most teachers in this country. My chief criticism would be that the first record, which is concerned with the sounds of spoken Hebrew, would have gained in usefulness by concentrating on some of the more difficult consonants—the gutturals, Qôph and Cădhê.

One caveat must be entered—this is not an all-sufficient course of instruction in Hebrew. No grammar of the language is provided, and for this one must turn to some such work as the English translation of Dr. Moses Rath's *Hebrew Grammar and Reader*,³ which gives all that is required. For lexical purposes, there is a good little *Hebrew English Dictionary* of the modern language by Dr. A. S. Waldstein.⁴ The grammatical system

² London, the Linguaphone Institute, 24-27, High Holborn. Hebrew text, pp. x.+88. Price 5s. Key, pp. xviii.+83. Price 3s. 6d.

³ Vienna, 1921.

⁴ The Mizpah Publishing Company, Tel-Aviv, Palestine. 4th edition, n.d.

of modern Hebrew is not difficult, and some knowledge of the language is the key to a literature which is of great interest to students of the Bible and of the Near East. Much information regarding it may be found in Dr. Shalom Spiegel's *Hebrew Reborn*.⁵ The somewhat high cost of the complete Linguaphone course (six guineas) is likely to restrict its sales, but regarding its value as a stimulus to a more systematic study of Biblical Hebrew, there can be little question.

Apropos of Hebrew studies, it may not be too late to call attention to the work of the Anglican Canon Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with introduction and brief explanatory notes*.⁶ The Mishnah has, as Dr. Danby points out, "considerable value, whether for the study of comparative religion, or for the study of the civilization of the Near East during the first and second centuries of our era, or for the study of Christian origins, or for the study of the development of Judaism and the conditions of Jewish life during the final stage of its association with the soil of Palestine."⁷ A short introduction to Talmud and Mishnah may be found in Dr. A. Lukyn William's *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity*.⁸ Hitherto, English readers, unfamiliar with Mishnaic Hebrew, have had to depend upon translations of individual tractates, or on such selections as Rodkinson's, of which Dr. G. F. Moore wrote: "It is in every respect impossible."⁹ Canon Danby's translation has been warmly praised by competent Jewish scholars, and his short notes, though not intended as a systematic commentary, give a good deal of help towards a better understanding of this highly compressed codex of Jewish legal procedure.

The French "Verbum Salutis" series has now reached its eighth volume and the sales prove that it has been a popular venture. The four volumes on the Gospels are in editions ranging from the sixteenth to the twentieth, and if the other volumes seem to be less successful, it is usually because they have been published more recently. With the issue of *Saint Paul: Les Epîtres de la Captivité*, translated and commented by Père Joseph Huby, S.J.,¹⁰ the series has entered upon a new phase. It is, as Père Huby explains in his *avant-propos*, the first number to be devoted to St. Paul, and the problem has been to produce a commentary which would be readable, fairly popular, and exegetically complete, without being too technical in character. It seemed evident that in explaining so difficult an author as St. Paul, a much greater place would have to be given to

⁵ Ernest Benn, Ltd., London, 1931.

⁶ Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933. pp. xxxii.+844. Price 18s.

⁷ Preface, p. v.

⁸ London, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1933. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. V, pp. 317-318.

⁹ *Judaism*, i, p. 173 n., quoted by Danby.

¹⁰ Beauchesne, Paris. 1935. pp. viii.+375. Price 15 frs.

philology. The Greek of the original would have to be frequently cited, and the exact sense of the words discussed. It might appear, at first sight, to be almost impossible to reconcile these various requisites and to produce a popular commentary. Yet Père Huby has succeeded and his little book is one of the most attractive in a very attractive series.

His method is to give a short introduction to each of the four epistles included (Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philipians); to translate a fairly long section of an epistle, and then to provide a running commentary, unencumbered by verse-divisions, which discusses all points of importance, while passing rapidly over what is obvious. In any commentary much depends upon the arrangement of text and notes, and it may be questioned whether the present method (which is, of course, a common one, as may be seen by reference to the earlier volumes of the *International Critical Commentary*) is not really a source of confusion, in spite of its somewhat deceptive air of an intimate *causerie*. Personally, I prefer the arrangement in the *Études Bibliques* series in which the notes are printed immediately below the text. The thoroughness of the commentary may be sufficiently judged by anybody who will take the trouble to read the notes on the "elements of the world" (Col. ii. 8) and on *harpagmos* (Phil. ii. 6). It would be difficult to find a more engaging introduction to the study of St. Paul.

The publishers of *Jésus de Nazareth, Roi des Juifs*, by Th. Salvagniac,¹¹ are very emphatic regarding the qualities which distinguish the work from every other Life of our Lord, but then, publishers of new books, like vendors of ripe fruit, are inclined to exaggerate a trifle. "To all ripeness under the sun," says George Eliot, "there comes a further stage of development which is less esteemed in the market." In the case of the present book, I have tried hard to discover some rare gift of penetration or masterly scholarship which would place it in the same category as Père Lagrange's *L'Evangile de Jésus-Christ*, or the equally well-known works by the Jesuit Fathers Lebreton and Prat. Unfortunately any such hall-mark of originality, if it exists in M. Salvagniac's work, has escaped me. If one may divide such Lives into the solidly informational and the imaginatively devotional, this obviously belongs to the second category. There are numerous attempts to enlarge upon the thoughts of the sacred characters, and a good deal of the book is first-class in the sense that it consists of the actual words of Holy Scripture cited *in extenso*. But I do not think that the possessors of Prat, or Lebreton, or Lagrange, need trouble to add this more recent, but far less accomplished work to their scriptural library.

The English translation of the second volume of Père Jules Lebreton's *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*¹² is, on the

¹¹ Lethielleux, Paris. 1935. pp. xi.+532. Price 30 frs.

¹² Burns Oates & Washbourne. 1935. pp. ix.+464. Price 10s. 6d.

whole, a very satisfactory piece of work and a great improvement upon the unrevised version of the first volume.¹³ A comparison with the original at a number of points shows that the unnamed translator has been equal to his task, even if at times he has failed to give his rendering the flavour of an original work. Two points must, however, be mentioned which are not entirely satisfactory. The first is that, as in the case of Volume I, foreign works that have been translated into English are often cited according to the original and not according to the English translation. So, for example, the inexperienced reader may not always be aware that Père de Grandmaison's *Jésus-Christ*, P. Fonck's *Die Parabeln des Herrn* and Père Bonsirven's *Sur les ruines du Temple* are all available in translated form. The second, a more serious criticism, is that quotations from English works are not always textually accurate (compare on p. 410 the citation from Swete's *The Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion*, p. 14, with the original, and on p. 58, the passage from Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, p. 38); and, in one instance I have noted, the quotation on p. 163 from Mr. J. H. Michael's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXI (1920), p. 158, there has plainly been a re-translation from the French, which departs in many instances from the author's *ipsissima verba*. This last practice, which was a characteristic of the late Fr. Duggan's rendering of Jacquier's first volume of the *History of the Books of the New Testament*, calls for no further emphasis.

Among minor slips are an incorrect citation (p. 4, n. 1) of Levesque's *Nos Quatre Evangiles* (referred to as *Les Quatres* [sic] *Evangiles*, but correctly cited on p. 225, n. 1); Zorrell for Zorell on p. 73, n. 2, line 10, and a mistake in the Greek in line 16; and, on p. 305, an incorrect designation of Principal Garvie, a Congregationalist, as an Anglican, and a mistake in the reference to his article in the *Expositor* which should read: "(1907), I, p. 167." On p. 355, the reference to *The Beginnings of Christianity* edited by Jackson and Lake should state the volume, since it is a five-volume work. In the last three instances the translator follows the author in misquotation which proves among other things that the maker of a version, if he is to be fully efficient, must be prepared to exercise some degree of control over the author's sources. The index is adequate, but those familiar with the French original will miss in the English translation the table of Gospel texts commented upon in the course of the work.

The second instalment of the "Westminster Version of the Old Testament" is Fr. Lattey's edition of *The Book of Ruth*.¹⁴ Every reader of the book of Ruth must have realized that, in spite of the general simplicity of the style and the plainness of the story as a whole, certain of the details, particularly

¹³ See CLERGY REVIEW. Vol. IX, pp. 152-54.

¹⁴ Longmans. 1935. pp. xl.+25. Price 2s. in paper covers and 2s. 6d. in cloth boards.

those concerned with the Hebrew marriage laws, stand in need of commentary. Fr. Lattey has devoted a great part of his introduction to a very thorough explanation of the questions connected with the *Goel* or kinsman, "a word to be understood in a special technical sense which the reader should endeavour to keep before him" (p. xv.). The relegation of this fundamental matter to the introduction, allows ample space for a discussion, in the notes on the text, of other interesting but puzzling features of the narrative. Once more Fr. Lattey has placed us heavily in his debt and has helped to make us better students of the inspired writings.

II. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

BY THE VERY REV. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

To deal first with the more fundamental aspects of our subject, we may call attention to Dr. Garrett Pierse's posthumously published study of the *Virtues and Vices*.¹ The author, a professor on the Dunboyne Foundation at Maynooth, had his work almost ready for the printer when he was overtaken by a fatal illness; but we are assured that it is printed exactly as the writer intended, but for the omission of a bibliography of periodical literature dealing with the subject. The book opens with a chapter on Christ our Lord as the pattern of all virtue, and it then proceeds along the usual lines of the manuals: virtue in general, moral virtue, theological virtue, vices. It closes with five chapters of historical matter dealing, for example, with the virtues and vices of the Jews and the Pauline teaching.

His method is to reduce to a minimum the discussion of controversial points which agitated the mediæval and classical theologians, giving us instead a clear statement of Thomistic doctrine. The result is a scholarly presentation of the treatise *De Virtutibus* of the theologians which can easily be assimilated by the general reader. Without any reservation, we can agree with Dr. Pierse's editor that the book will be regarded as a classical one on the subject in English. The author gives a very slight treatment to the moral virtues—scarcely two pages to Prudence, "*auriga omnium virtutum*," and only eight pages to Justice. On the other hand, the theological virtues, particularly Faith, which occupies about one-fourth of the whole book, are treated fully and generously. Dr. Pierse shows that theological conclusions, with certain qualifications, belong to the subject-matter of faith, and likewise dogmatic facts. The extensive bibliography of fifty pages, though useful, could well have been dispensed with in favour of a good Index which, unfortunately, is lacking.

Lord Moynihan's proposed Bill to legalize the killing of people suffering from incurable disease is supported by many, including

¹ *Virtues and Vices*, by Rev. Garrett Pierse, D.D.; edited by W.M. Browne & Nolan. 403 pages. 7s. 6d.

a certain number of ministers in Protestant sects. A Society, called the "Voluntary Euthanasia Legislation Society," held its first meeting in December at the British Medical Association House, at which it was claimed that fourteen prominent religious leaders had signed a statement publicly expressing their opinion that what was proposed under the Bill was not contrary to the teachings of Christ or to the principles of Christianity. The actual principles of Christianity have been affirmed at various Catholic meetings up and down the country, and the voice of Dr. O'Donovan will be sorely missed if this Bill comes up for discussion in Parliament. A carefully constructed article in the Belgian medical journal of the *Société de SS. Cosme and Damien*² puts the position well, from the point of view of the Catholic moralist, distinguishing between actions which have for their immediate end the killing of the sufferer and actions which have some lawful purpose, such as the alleviation of extreme pain, and which are accompanied indirectly by a second ill effect which may be the shortening of life. As a rule the subject is, at present, scantily treated in the Manuals.

Dr. Halliday Sutherland, in his latest work, entitled *The Laws of Life*,³ lives up to the standard we have been led to expect from him as a writer of good English and a delightful *raconteur*. Apart from a chapter on the *Use and Abuse of Alcohol*, it is chiefly concerned with the modern attack on life: contraception, heredity, sterilization, euthanasia are all commented upon in the course of the book—which does not contain a dull page. The histories of the Bradlaugh trial and of his own case *v. Stopes* are re-told, and there are many happy and apposite quotations from all kinds of sources. The words of Lord Justice Atkin, quoted from memory, are very much to the point: "The suggestion that a woman has the right to terminate the life of her child is news to me. But if she does possess this right, when does it cease? At the birth, but, if so, why?" Some few statements are rather loose: "If a man desires more than a girl's friendship, and obtains what he wants without marriage, there is no reason why he should marry her." What is meant, no doubt, is that there may be grave reasons why he should not marry her. And what is the foundation for the view that "in primitive times the man clubbed the lady on the head and carried her off to his cave"?

The publishers, if they have obtained an "Imprimatur," have not printed it on the book, and their statement that, in dealing with contraception and sterilization, ethics have been left out of the question, may be meant to imply that this type of work does not come within the law of Canon 1385. Nevertheless, in the most important chapter of the book, dealing with the "Safe Period," we read that "for those who object to contraceptives on ethical and religious grounds, the safe period offers a solution

² Rue des Palais, 90, Brussels.

³ Sheed & Ward. 281 pages. 6s.

to a most difficult problem. The Catholic Church prohibits the use of contraceptives, but permits the use of the safe period. The safe period does not represent heroic virtue, but it does call for the exercise of a reasonable amount of self-discipline. If, then, the safe period be permitted, an accurate knowledge of what it is should be available for all engaged or married couples." This is indubitably "ethical" teaching, but it is not an adequate statement of what the Catholic Church permits. There is always required, and as a condition *sine qua non* for the lawfulness of using the safe period, a proportionately grave reason for so acting, for example, the health of the wife or extreme poverty. Any action which is judged to be lawful *ex parte objecti* may, nevertheless, be wrong because of the circumstances and the intention of the agent. And has the author sufficiently reflected on the problem raised concerning the validity of marriage consent on the part of an engaged couple who study these pages? We would very much like to see this section amended, so as to bring this excellent book completely in line with Catholic moral teaching, of which its distinguished author has always been a most valiant defender.

The latest addition to Fr. Cappello's well-established series, *De Sacramentis*, is devoted to Holy Orders.⁴ In twelve chapters we are given a very complete manualist treatment of this Sacrament under its dogmatic, moral, canonical and pastoral aspect. We may select a few points under each of these headings. The Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, declaring the invalidity of Anglican Orders, is considered an infallible sentence: "Agitur de sententia infallibili ex cathedra prolata, ita ut de nullitate ordinationum anglicanarum dubium ullum haberi nequeat." The author's discussion of this important question is of a rather summary character. But his treatment of the controversies concerning the "minister" of the sacrament is very full—in fact, the best we have seen. Whilst setting out the view of Escobar and others that the Holy See can grant to a simple priest the power of ordaining priests, he considers it neither intrinsically nor extrinsically probable. The difficult documents are fully examined. With regard, for example, to the Bull of Boniface IX which appears to grant this power to the Abbot of St. Osyth in Essex, Fr. Cappello favours this solution: it was permission given by the Holy See to the Abbot to grant dimissorial letters independently of the Bishop of London.⁵ Holy Orders externally received but with no internal intention of acceptance are considered invalid, contrary to the opinion of Cardinal Gasparri. The intricate regulations concerning incardination by receiving the Tonsure, and concerning irregularities,

⁴ *Felix M. Cappello, S.J., Tractatus Canonico-Moralis De Sacramentis, Vol. II, part iii., De Sacra Ordinatione. Accedit Appendix De Jure Orientalium.* Marietti, 1935. 716 pages. 27 lire.

⁵ See CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, Vol. IV, pp. 341 and 424, for a discussion of this document.

are fully discussed, though we would like a more explicit opinion as to the procedure in the case of a *tonsurandus* who is a minor; also a decision would be welcome regarding the power of the Ordinary to dispense from a doubtful irregularity of heresy—the author rightly says: “controvertitur de iis qui *bona fide* sectae hereticae vel schismatica adscripti fuerint. Practice dispensatione opus est, saltem ad cautelam, et pro foro externo.”

From the Catholic University of America we have two very large treatises, one on canonical evidence in marriage causes the other on Wills.⁶ The author of the first treatise has had the advantage of practical experience in ecclesiastical courts, and he discusses every point of procedure that is likely to arise in the conduct of a marriage case before a diocesan tribunal, including the evidence given in cases of non-consummation of marriages and those dealt with under the summary procedure of canon 1990. The work will be of great use to the officials of a diocesan *curia*. We think that the author's method of abbreviation in citing authorities, though designed to assist the student, will prove an obstacle. For example, the Code *Fontes* are referred to as “c.i.c.f.”, Cardinal Gasparri as “gasp”.

The author of the treatise on *Wills in Canon Law* has chosen an exceptionally difficult subject as a doctorate thesis, and one which we believe has not been so thoroughly studied before. In points where the civil law has to be considered, Dr. Hannan is naturally concerned chiefly with American law. This is particularly noticeable in the chapter on Bequests for Masses. For various reasons he considers it best that a testator should establish a fund, during his life-time, in the hands of a trustee, to be distributed by him after the testator's death.

Another example of the simultaneous treatment of civil and canon law, in France, raises a certain envy for something of the kind in England. Subjects dealt with at various times in that admirable collection *Documentation Catholique* are being assembled together in alphabetical order, and two volumes have appeared to date.⁷ The work will be completed in ten volumes which may be had at the special price of 125 francs. Each subject is dealt with separately as civil or canon law and an adequate bibliography is given for each section.

The same French publishing house produce a well-known series of Acts of the Holy See, with a French translation, including many documents which do not find their way into the official *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. The Acts of Pius XI have already stretched to six volumes, varying between 250 to 400 pages, each costing only four francs.

⁶ *Canonical Evidence in Marriage Cases*, by Rev. Francis Wanenmacher, J.C.D., Dolphin Press, 412 pages, \$3.50; *The Canon Law of Wills*, by Rev. J. D. Hannan, S.T.D., Dolphin Press, 517 pages, \$3.50.

⁷ *Répertoire Pratique de Droit Civil et Ecclesiastique* par un groupe de professeurs et jurisconsultes. Vol. I, *Abjuration—Avortement*, 550 pages, 15 fr.; Vol. II, *Bail—Bureaux de Placement*, 553 pages, 15 fr. Maison de la Bonne Presse.

*Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*⁸ is now appearing with greater regularity. The latest fascicule contains a long article on Baptism in the West by Dr. Torquebiau of the Toulouse Catholic Institute.

The series of text-books on liturgical laws and rubrics by Van der Stappen have always been in good repute because of their clarity and simplicity. The fourth edition is edited by Dr. Groegaert, professor of Sacred Liturgy in the Seminary of Malines.⁹ Van der Stappen's arrangement has been further simplified by presenting the whole work in two volumes. For the better appreciation of the liturgy a useful historical bibliography is given for the various offices. The work remains, however, in substance, that of its first author. Dr. Groegaert has another distinct volume on the rubrics of the Missal.¹⁰ This treatise is not a recension of Van der Stappen but an entirely new work. By reducing the citations of Roman decrees to the minimum, or by relegating them to the notes, he has given us a systematic and practical explanation of the rubrics of the Missal which the clergy will find more than adequate for their needs. Cardinal Mercier's exhortation to his clergy, on the eve of his death, concerning the greatness and sanctity of the priestly office is given as a preface. The author is a prominent figure in the liturgical revival abroad, and his attractive well-printed volumes will promote the movement amongst the clergy wherever his work is used. For accuracy, brevity and concision these text-books are ideal for Seminary use.

III. PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

The scope of pastoral theology is so wide that it is difficult to delimit the subject-matter and to separate it from that of the various sacred sciences. The *Catholic Encyclopædic Dictionary* defines and describes pastoral theology as "that branch of theology which deals with the care of souls. It takes the teaching of dogmatic, moral and ascetic theology and the rules of canon law and applies them to the every day work of the parochial clergy in all its aspects." One of the most satisfactory and comprehensive works on the subject in English, *Manual of Pastoral Theology*,¹ speaks of it as a "special branch of theological science" whose object is "to teach those practical rules which a priest ought to observe in the faithful discharge of the sacred ministry." But Fr. Davis, S.J., in his *Moral and Pastoral Theology*,² writes: "Pastoral Theology is not a

⁸Fascicule VII, *Baccalauréat—Baptême*. Letouzey, 1935.

⁹*Cæremoniale ad normam recent. decretorum*, opera Aug. Groegaert. Pars prior, De Ministris; Pars altera, De Celebrante. Dessain, 1935, Belgas 9.80, each volume.

¹⁰*Tractatus De Rubricis Missalis Romani*. Editio Prima. Dessain, 1935.

¹By the Rev. Frederic Schutze. Herder. Third edition, 1923.

²By H. Davis, S.J. Heythrop Series II, four volumes. Sheed & Ward. 30s.

separate science having its own subject matter; but it is the practical art of applying the conclusions of Moral Theology."

In truth the subject is not theology at all; it is not a science in the strict sense of the word. Science is of universals; pastoral theology, taking the universals of several sciences for granted, descends to the particulars of their application. Its exposition demands a knowledge of one or other of the ecclesiastical branches of learning together with experience in the application of that knowledge. Science, wisdom, prudence all go to the making of the pastoral theologian. Every professor in the seminary teaches pastoral theology in so far as he calls upon his own experience to produce practical rules for the application of his subject to the actual work of the mission. But it is clear that while pastoral theology may thus touch on any subject from sermons to book-keeping, from the details of the liturgy to the management of the Children of Mary, it is moral theology which offers the widest field for such exposition.

Those who have observed Fr. Davis's occasional articles during the past ten or twelve years will know how practical his outlook is, how his attention has always been focused on the actualities of the time. They will therefore expect to find in his recent and most substantial work *vide supra*, a valuable contribution to pastoral theology. And, as a matter of fact, they will see that his principles are always brought into contact with the facts, the conditions especially of our country and our day. He keeps an eye on English law, on English problems and customs; not, of course, that he confines himself to these particulars, but that he does get down to them. He has long been interested in that medical borderland of his subject which is so full of ethical problems, and the latest word on these problems will be found here. It is not my business to review this work under its primary aspect of moral theology (though I may be permitted to remark that I have found it extremely satisfactory and useful in the short time since its first appearance), but I feel sure that the pastor who desires ready and prudent counsel in the application of his moral principles will find it abundantly here. And further I would say that these four handsome volumes are gratifyingly cheap at thirty shillings.

An importance subsection of pastoral theology is pastoral medicine. A good deal is to be found in the works of Eschbach and Antonelli, and the American doctors, Walsh and O'Malley, have produced works that are well known; but none of these have given all that was felt to be necessary. As a rule, the lack of an adequate text-book is supplied by the professor's notes. To treat the subject separately as autonomous is to run the risk of making it grow unduly. Students want just so much information as is necessary to ensure a complete understanding of the relevant sections of moral theology and to enable them to apply these in their pastoral work. We do not want our clergy to be cheap and inefficient doctors; but they should be able to recognize when it is necessary to call medicine to their aid and competent to give

judgment on the morality of medical practice; and they need a little knowledge of physiology and anatomy in order to understand certain sins and the occasions of such sins.

Herder has recently published a rather large book which seems to me to meet these requirements. It is a translation from the German by the Rev. T. A. Rattler, O.S.A., of a German work, *Pastoral Medicine*, by the Rev. Ludwig Ruland, D.D., who is professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Wurzburg. It is a bulky volume which is to be followed by another, so that the whole work promises to be rather large. But it is full of information, and, as far as I am able to judge, of accurate information. This volume deals with, Chapter 1, the beginnings of human life (conception, pregnancy, etc.); 2, conditions of food and health (heating, housing, digestion, etc.); 3, euphoria and euphoric luxuries (alcohol, tobacco, tea, cocaine); 4, life in sickness and in health (diagnosis, treatment, homoeopathy); 5, questions involving moral theology and psychology (hypnosis, psychoanalysis, hysteria); 6, ethics of sex-life.

While the whole of the matter is interesting I think that the second, third and fourth chapters are not particularly necessary. The first is essential and is not unduly detailed; perhaps, considering the size of the book it is insufficiently detailed. The same applies to the fifth (questions concerning moral theology and psychology); it is excellent so far as it goes. The section on psychoanalysis is judicious but not satisfying, yet the author does find time to make two most important points: (1) he shows the difference between psychoanalysis and the use of the confessional, a difference so constantly blurred in controversy on this subject; and (2) he warns priests against personal indulgence in the practice of psychoanalysis. The section on hysteria is excellent, but I would willingly have sacrificed some of the pages devoted to the question of personal hygiene for a fuller treatment here. The last chapter is very well done and is worth the careful attention of confessors.

Fr. Finney's well-known work, *Moral Problems in Hospital Practice*,³ has gone into a fifth edition during the past year. "The manual consists of two parts, of which the first embodies an effort to cover a wide field of operations and kindred medical cases, in the simple form of question and answer, and the second repeats these questions, and states at some length the principles upon which the answers are based." Since the time of its first appearance, some fourteen or fifteen years ago, I have always been doubtful as to whether the thorny moral problems concerning gynæcological practice were amenable to this sort of treatment. A fifth edition would seem to indicate that the book has met a need successfully, but it does not resolve my doubt. Anybody who will take the trouble to compare Fr. Davis's careful and painstaking treatment of ectopic pregnancy in the

³ By the Rev. Patrick A. Finney, C.M. Herder. 6s.

second volume of *Moral and Pastoral Theology* with Fr. Finney's decisive condemnation will, I think, share my hesitancy.

Abortion, a small book published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., at 4s. 6d., contains four sections: the first gives the British Law as to Abortion in quotations from sections 58 and 59 of Offences against the Person Act (1861); the second is a plea by Miss Stella Browne, for legalized abortion, an essay which "aims at stating the case for freedom of choice by women as regards the continuation to term of pregnancy or its interruption by medical and scientific methods"; the third by Captain A. M. Ludovici is a statement of the case against legalized abortion; and the fourth is an attempt to find a middle course, by Dr. Harry Roberts. Those who may have to debate the subject may consult the book with some profit, but the Catholic-minded reader will find in it much that is repugnant.

*Sound Spending*⁴ is a very substantial volume of 238 pages written by the Professor of Administration, and Treasurer, of St. Mary Seminary. It is a monument of American business-efficiency as applied to the administration of "Schools, Colleges, Hospitals, Orphanages, Convents, Monasteries, etc., Seminaries, Parishes." It sets out to tell the "treasurer" everything he wants to know about office-arrangement, buying, budgeting, food, kitchen, laundry, maintenance. It is conceived on a scale which will make the ordinary English bursar green with envy: "Suppose you are operating a boarding school and your annual expense is approximately \$1,000,000. You are reimbursed \$800,000 from room rent, board, tuition, fees, scholarships, etc., and you are endowed to the extent of \$200,000. You are merely breaking even and making no headway whatever in a sound economic plan." The book is full of sound sense and is starkly denuded of any grace of style. Procurators are notoriously a hard-bitten company and they may be expected to be indifferent to the American idiom; if they will brace themselves to the task of reading *Sound Spending* their dependents, no less than their superiors, may have reason to be grateful to Fr. Walsh.

One science more than any other is, whether avowedly or not, at the root of all pastoral theology. As the virtue which inspires it is prudence, so the science which is common to all its sections is positive psychology. Psychological insight is necessary to the successful application of moral theology in the confessional, of dogma in preaching, of apologetic in controversy. Hence a little book by the veteran psychologist Fr. de la Vaissière, S.J., may suitably find its place here. *La Pudeur Instinctive*⁵ deals with the nature and cultivation of the *instinct* of sexual modesty. (Fr. de la Vaissière finds it difficult to define "pudeur"; it is, I think, impossible to translate it by any single English word.) The author is not here directly concerned with the virtue of purity but with that "sensitive dynamism of almost instinctive

⁴ By Rev. Joseph F. Walsh, M.A. Seminary Press, Cleveland, Ohio. \$2.50.

⁵ Les Editions du Cerf, Juvisy.

apprehension which is directly connected with the sexual processes." Its function is to act as a sort of automatic brake which comes into play when the machinery of sex is set in motion. The second part of the book is devoted to the problem of educating the child in modesty. The practical results of the enquiry may prove disappointing to the reader, as they seem to have done to the author: so little can be done positively, so few pedagogic rules can be given. But the work has not been in vain, for Fr. de la Vaissière has not only produced an essay interesting to the theorist, but he has disposed of such modern pedagogical errors as are contained in the psychoanalytic approach to this question or in the specious plea to save modesty by dissipating ignorance.

I cannot speak too highly of Dr. Mary Kidd's little book, *Ideal Motherhood*.⁶ Written in a simple and intimate style, it combines information and sound sense with high ideals and Catholic principles. It can safely be recommended to the expectant mothers for whom it is prepared.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MASS VESTMENTS.

May a priest, without any special delegation, bless the alb amice and girdle? In other words may one restrict the term "Indumenta sacerdotalia," the blessing of which is reserved, to the chasuble, stole and maniple? (V.)

REPLY.

The *Roman Ritual*, Tit. viii., cap. xx., places the form "Benedictio Sacerdotalium Indumentorum" amongst the blessings reserved to the bishop or to others enjoying the faculty. These include, from Canon 1304, the parish priest, the Ordinary's delegate, the religious superior and his delegate. It is the custom in many places for the Vicars Forane to be delegated, either for their deanery or for the whole diocese. If the blessing of these vestments is given without proper delegation by a simple priest, it is valid but unlawful: Canon 1147, §3 "Benedictio reservata quae a presbytero detur sine necessaria licentia, illicita est, sed valida, nisi in reservatione Sedes Apostolica aliud expresserit."

We think that the alb, etc., are clearly included. The rubrics of the Missal draw no distinction in directing that the "paramenta" should be blessed by the bishop or his delegate, both in *Ritus Servandus*, n. 1, and in *De Defectibus*, n. 10, and the manualists take it for granted that they are included, e.g., Prummer, III, 298.

E. J. M.

⁶ Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. 101 and vii. 2s. 6d.

MASS BELL.

When must, or may, the bell be rung by the server at a side altar? The ringing of the bell at the side altars is sometimes objected to by the priest who is celebrating at the High Altar. (X.)

REPLY.

The directions of the S.C.R. do not explicitly deal with this point. The bell should not be rung during Exposition,¹ nor if Mass is being said at an altar within sight of the clergy reciting office in choir, nor if Mass is being said "tempore piae supplicationis," by which is meant apparently a religious procession.²

But it does not follow that the bell at side altars must always be rung, except in the instances explicitly mentioned by the S.C.R. For the principle evidently is that the bell at a side altar should not be rung, whenever it would disturb a solemn function in progress at the time in the church, for example, a sung Mass, a Requiem, or a sermon.³ We are of the opinion that the celebration of Low Mass at the High Altar does not come within this definition, certainly not on week-days. Whether the parochial or public Low Mass on Sundays is the equivalent of a solemn function must be left, we think, to the decision of the rector of the church; we think that, as a general rule, the bell at side altars should be rung, since at a Low Mass the practice does not disturb either the function or the worshippers.

E. J. M.

MISSA PAROECIALIS.

The Right Rev. Mgr. C. J. Cronin, D.D., V.G., writes:—

In the CLERGY REVIEW for January (p. 61), the learned theologian and canonist who answers the questions writes: "There is not, we believe, any very strict meaning to be given to the term 'Missa Parochialis,' etc." I am sorry that I must disagree with this statement; but this is a very practical question, and it is important that it should be accurately understood.

The term "Missa Parochialis" has a very definite and fixed meaning in the Liturgy. Listen to this from the *Decreta Authentica* of the S. Congr. of Rites: "... Diversis tamen coarctatur interpretationibus sensus verborum *Missa parochialis*. Hinc Rmus Epus . . . petit: I. Quenam Missa per ea verba juxta mentem ipsius S. Congregationis intelligenda est?—S.R.C. . . . rescribendum censuit: Ad I. Parochialis Missa

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3448.

² *ib.*, n. 3814.

³ *Periodica*, Vol. XII, p. 37.

appellanda est quam Parochi diebus Festis etiam abrogatis tenentur applicare pro populo " (November 28th, 1884; n. 3623, ad 1).

Hence the Missa Parochialis is defined by representative liturgists thus:—

Pighi-Ferrais: *Liturgia Sacerdotalis*, n. 322: "Missa Parochialis est, quae diebus festis et Dominicis a Parocho celebratur et pro populo applicatur."

De Amicis: *Caereemoniale Parochorum*, I, n. 151 (Italian edition, I, p. 363): "Pro parochiali missa intelligitur ea quae ab animarum pastoribus diebus festis, etiamsi suppressis, celebratur et pro populo applicatur."

Brehm: *Synopsis Additionum et Variationum in Editione typica Missalis Romani*, p. 106: "Missa parochialis est ea quae quibusdam diebus ab animarum pastoribus Officio diei conformis celebrari atque pro populo sibi commissio applicari debet."

Wuest-Mullaney: *Matters Liturgical*, n. 364: "N.B.—The Mass which must be applied for the people by those mentioned in nn. 363, 364, is called the Parochial Mass."

The S. Congr. of Rites has also decreed as follows: "Num Missa parochialis, etiam non cantata, rationem habeat Missae conventualis, ita ut in ea supprimi debeant tum commemoratio simplicis tum preces post Missam?—Resp. Negative" (May 28th, 1897, n. 3957, ad 3).

In view of this decree, it is open to question whether a *Missa parochialis lecta* can be regarded as an occasion of "aliqua solemnitas," or whether the prayer for the King is a "sacra functio seu pium exercitium" in the sense of the decree of S.R.C., June 30th, 1913 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, V, 311).

REPLY.

Notwithstanding the definition of a parochial Mass adopted by certain authors from a decree of the Congregation of Rites, we are of the opinion that it is more correct to say that the term has no very strict legal meaning. It cannot, we think, be taken as a synonym for "Missa pro Populo" to the exclusion of any other meaning.

(1) This view is supported by other texts issuing from S.C.R. There is one, for example, dated February 21st, 1896, which fixed the obligation of celebrating Mass corresponding to the Office, on days when some other extrinsic festival was being observed (presumably a votive Mass): "Obligationem, in casu, quoad Missam Conventualem Officio diei respondentem, adesse pro Ecclesiis in quibus ea die fit Officiatura Choralis; quoad vero Missam Parochialem, eam Officio diei conformem esse debere, quando peragenda sit cum applicatione pro populo."¹

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3887.

The Congregation clearly recognizes a Parochial Mass which is not applied "pro populo." Or examine the wording of a question sent from Northampton in 1858, long before the obligation of "Missa pro Populo" existed: ". . . quando propter inopiam cantorum Missa principalis, quae est etiam Conventualis vel Parochialis, cantari non potest. . . ." (n. 3065). It will be said, with truth, that these statements are mere *obiter dicta*. But, almost as much may be said about decree n. 3623, quoted by our distinguished correspondent, for the definition therein was given in the course of solving the chief doubt submitted. It was concerned with the insertion of a Collect in Austria *Pro Imperatore* "in missis solemnibus vel parochialibus," and the questioner wanted to know what exactly was the parochial Mass to which this Collect was to be added. The doubt was solved by giving a definition which certainly, apart from its context, absolutely supports our correspondent's contention. But, taken in its context, it may be no more than a definition of "Missa Parochialis" in the matter under discussion, namely, the Mass in which the Collect was to be added.

(2) The Code also seems to give a sense to "Missa Paroecialis" which is much wider than "Missa pro Populo." From Canon 466, §§4 and 5, the obligation of applying Mass for the people may be fulfilled elsewhere than in the parish church, and may be said outside of the parish by a priest who is legitimately absent. Are we to conclude that, in the legitimate absence of the parish priest who elects to fulfil his obligation personally, the parish church must be without a parochial Mass? Canon 821, §2, states: "In nocte Nativitatis Domini inchoari media nocte potest sola Missa conventualis vel paroecialis, non autem alia sine Apostolico Indulto." Are we to conclude that, in similar circumstances, there can be no Midnight Mass in a parish church without an Apostolic Indult?

Rightly, therefore, in our opinion, certain authors, who have weighed the subject in all its bearings, see more than one meaning in the term "Missa Paroecialis," as, for example, the writer in *Ami du Clergé*, 1928, p. 528, and, more recently, the writer in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1935, p. 305: ". . . liturgists, as we have seen, tend to identify *paroecialis* and *publica* and to broaden the meaning of *missa paroecialis*. . . . A Mass may be called parochial for many reasons, not merely because it is applied for the people, but also because said for their benefit to enable them to fulfil their Sunday obligation, or because it is said in a parish church, or as a parochial duty by the parish clergy. We think that a Mass said at a fixed hour in a parish church for the benefit of the people of a parish may rightly be called a parochial Mass. It is parochial *triplici ratione* since it is said for parishioners in a parish church and in discharge of a parochial duty."

(3) With regard to the Leonine Prayers we agree with our correspondent that a *Missa parochialis lecta*, in whatever sense

the word is taken, is not *in se* an occasion for omitting them. We were dealing with such a Mass, *preceded by the Asperges and followed by the prayer for the King*, so that the reply n. 3957, ad 3, is not relevant. In any case, the *dubium* for Westminster and, no doubt, for some other dioceses, is solved by the official directions of the Ordo.

E. J. M.

MENTAL RECITATION OF PRAYER.

"Z" writes:—

In your issue for December, 1935, p. 483, replying to "(R.)," you mention the Penitentiary Decree of December 7th, 1933, which makes the mere *mental* recitation of Ejaculatory Prayers sufficient for gaining Indulgences attached to them. The Reply continues: "But Canon 934, §3, *resolves this point*" (*italics mine everywhere*) by its ruling, which "has often been repeated in instructions given for prayers to be recited during Jubilees," viz.: "Satis est orationem alternis cum socio recitare, aut mente eam prosequi dum ab alio recitatur." Surely the Decree of 1933 definitely concedes more than the Canon cited? The latter supposes a dual recitation of the same prayer, e.g., of a psalm—in which one person—A—prays in company with B, who does the vocalizing, while A only *thinks* the verse. But the *Decree* further enables a *solitary person* to gain the Indulgences (attached to Ejaculations) by a purely mental performance. This seems a distinct point not covered by the Canon and a very useful one for invalids.

REPLY.

The word "this" refers to the point raised by "R," not to the point settled by the decree of December 7th, 1933, of which our correspondent's explanation is entirely correct. We regret that a misunderstanding has arisen through the ambiguous position of the word "this".

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

THE ENCYCLICAL ON THE PRIESTHOOD.

The most important Roman Document since our last bulletin is, of course, the Encyclical Letter *Ad Catholici Sacerdotii* of His Holiness the Pope, dated December 20th, 1935, the fifty-sixth year of the Holy Father's priesthood and the fourteenth of his Pontificate. The Encyclical is a lengthy document of over 15,000 words, and as it will shortly be available in English in pamphlet form, only a summary indication of its contents need be given here.

In a brief introduction, the Holy Father points out that this is the logical sequence to the previous pronouncements on the Education of Youth, Christian Marriage, the Social Order and others.

I. *The offices and powers of the Priesthood.*—The primary office of the priest is to offer sacrifice, by which he has power over the very body of Jesus Christ, and makes it present upon our altars. Secondly, the priest has powers over the mystical body of Christ. Chief among these powers is the power to remit sins. Thirdly, by his preaching "amidst the awful corruptions of human malice" he is able to point out to one and all the right course they should follow. Fourthly, the priest is the official intercessor of humanity before God, especially in the recitation of the Divine Office. "If our Lord made such magnificent and solemn promises even to private prayers how much more powerful must be that prayer which is said *ex officio* in the name of the Church."

II. *The obligations of the priest.*—So holy an office demands a purity of heart and a sanctity of life befitting the solemnity and holiness of the office he holds. "It would be a grave error should the priest, carried away by false zeal, neglect his own sanctification, and become over immersed in the external works, however holy, of the priestly ministry." The particular virtues demanded are solid piety towards God and our Blessed Lady; chastity, with its obligation of celibacy, though the Holy Father makes due allowance for the different discipline in the Oriental Church; detachment from worldly goods. While not debarred from accepting the reward of his labour, the priest must seek after no other recompense than our Lord's promise of heavenly reward. "Woe to the priest greedy of filthy lucre. Such a priest, besides failing in his vocation, would earn the contempt even of his own people." By this detachment, the priest becomes a true father of the poor. Finally, there is the obligation of learning. The priest should continue his theological

stadio
semin
it mu
priest
encou
the c
them
scien
stand
of th

III
grave
Thos
progr
ever
ordin
vocat
youn
not c
abus
socie
rank
betra

Th
secul
who
Chur
votiv
been
gene

Tv
Chur
John
St.
chur
are
Mar
of th

Th
afre
CLE
the
a de
gene
p. 4
and
indu
the

studies with unremitting zeal. The knowledge acquired at the seminary is a sufficient foundation with which to begin, but it must be continued, extended and made more thorough. The priest must be healthily modern, as is the Church. Wise encouragement and help should be given to those members of the clergy who, by taste and special gifts, feel a call to devote themselves to study and research in any particular branch of science or art. The rest of the clergy must attain a higher standard of general education and learning than the average of the laity of the time.

III. *The training of priests.*—Superiors are warned of their grave obligations in regard to aspirants to the priesthood. Those who show themselves unsuitable must not be allowed to progress almost to the threshold of the sanctuary, when it is ever more difficult for them to draw back, and when they accept ordination through human respect. All should strive to foster vocations, which flourish in the various organizations for the young, and particularly in the Christian family. Parents must not oppose the vocations of their sons. This is a "deplorable abuse" found too commonly in the more cultured classes of society, which are on the whole so scantily represented in the ranks of the clergy. The Holy Father calls this "vocation betrayed" a source of tears both to sons and their parents.

The Encyclical concludes with an exhortation to priests, secular and regular, all over the world, and especially to those who are still studying for the priesthood—"the hope of the Church and of the people." By the Holy Father's wish a special votive Mass: *De summo et aeterno Jesu Christi Sacerdotio*, has been prepared which may be said on Thursdays, subject to the general liturgical rules.

VISITATION OF THE SEVEN ALTARS.

Two ancient pilgrimages in Rome are those of the Seven Churches—St. Peter, St. Paul *fuori*, St. Sebastian *fuori*, St. John Lateran, Holy Cross in Jerusalem, St. Laurence *fuori*, and St. Mary Major; and of the Seven Privileged Altars in those churches, especially in St. Peter's. The altars in St. Peter's are: (1) The Gregorian of Our Lady, (2) SS. Processus and Martinianus, (3) St. Michael, (4) St. Petronilla, (5) Our Lady of the Pillar, (6) SS. Simon and Jude, (7) St. Gregory the Great.

The pilgrimage of the Seven Churches has recently been defined afresh, and its indulgences settled (A.A.S., XXVII, p. 60. CLERGY REVIEW, September, 1935, p. 232). The pilgrimage of the Seven Altars is now similarly defined and regularized by a decree of October 2nd, 1935, issued from the Office of Indulgences of the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary (A.A.S., XXVII, p. 449, November 25th, 1935). After adverting to the confusion and uncertainty that surrounds this ancient pilgrimage and its indulgences, and the decreased devotion to it which has resulted, the Decree records that the Holy Father, greatly desirous of

the revival of the pilgrimage, has ordered that its details and indulgences be settled and determined. They are accordingly now set forth. To all visiting the Seven Altars in the Vatican Basilica the following indulgences are granted :

(1) Indulgence of seven years for a visit to each altar, at which prayers are said to the Titular of the altar.

(2) A plenary indulgence on the usual conditions, on the feast of the Titular of the altar, if a visit is made in the required form.

(3) A plenary indulgence on the usual conditions if each of the seven altars is visited on one day, *ad normam* can. 923. (Canon 923 defines "one day" for this purpose as extending from noon of the previous day to midnight of the day itself.)

By Pontifical Indult, the faithful can gain the following indulgences for the Seven Altars "*ad instar*" in churches in the city and even outside the city to which by Papal Indult the privilege is granted :

(1) An indulgence of seven years for a visit to an altar, when *pia mente et saltem corde contrito* some prayer is said in honour of the Titular of the altar.

(2) An indulgence of seven years on the feast of the Titular of the altar.

(3) A plenary indulgence on the usual conditions may be gained by anyone who in the manner laid down on one day makes a visit to all the above-mentioned altars.

ABSOLUTION OF AN ACCOMPLICE : A CORRECTION.

A correspondent calls attention to an inaccuracy in the comment on a decree of the Holy Office, which appeared in these notes in March, 1935 (Vol. IX, p. 248).

The distinction between direct and indirect persuasion ought to have been given in the precise terms of a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated February 19th, 1896, to which commentators on canon 2367 uniformly refer. Hence, in the section entitled "The Absolution of an Accomplice," the first paragraph should lose its final "if" clause, and the second its first six words. The text will thus read : "*indirect*, if a confessor were to persuade an accomplice that what has been done is not a grave sin. . . ." Four lines further on, the clause which begins "For if the penitent had been persuaded" would perhaps be clearer if the words "by the confessor" were added.

BOOK REVIEWS

Healing: Pagan and Christian. By G. G. Dawson, M.A., B.D.
(Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1935.
pp. 309. 9s.)

Many factors go to determine the mood in which the reviewer, that humble camp-follower of literature, undertakes his necessary task. It may be that the subject-matter of a book, or the authority of its writer, stimulates him pleasantly. He may succumb to the literary charm, or to the clarity of a writer, and when he confines his reviewing to some special subject within his own field of interest he has the satisfaction of feeling able to assess the value of what he reads. But his task is not all satisfaction. Not all books are well written, not all have the rhythm of good English, and, alas, not all deal with subjects within their author's special competence. No cobbler leaves his last so often and for so long as the literary cobbler, and his wanderings provide the bleak and barren moments of the reviewer's life.

It is therefore with but a feeble spring of hope in his breast that the present reviewer settles down to this book on "*Healing: Pagan and Christian*," by a doctor—not of medicine, but of Divinity. The perilous fascination of a loaded gun for the small boy is, it would appear, a mild passion compared with the zest with which divines commit to paper their convictions upon certain forms of healing.

It is not necessary to discourse upon the compelling motives which urge them along these dangerous and—for them—dimly-lit paths, but it may not be superfluous to emphasize that access to a library and industrious reading of the relevant books are an inadequate equipment to deal with the complex problems of healing, and works on this subject that have no other illumination than the midnight oil can do no more than smell of the lamp. It is only first-hand experience of the art and science of medicine that can qualify a writer to deal with any of the many aspects of healing—can qualify him even to assess the value and significance of what he may read.

Mr. Dawson's book has all the characters which are inevitable in a work on healing from the hand of a non-medical author. The best of books is apt to have the defects of its qualities, but this one has only the qualities of its defects. It is, by its author's definition, "an attempt to consider, in a comprehensive manner, the whole realm of the therapeutic art, as the restora-

tion of perfect soundness to the individual by the avenues of body, mind and spirit." Surely an ambitious project—and one to be judged by its aims. It begins, characteristically, by teaching the physician his job. "The usual treatment of the sick," we are told, "is departmental. . . The whole individual is sick, and reacts as an entity to his affliction. The physician ought to remember that he is to treat a person and not only a pain." But surely, the very essence of the art of medicine—which is something very different from the science thereof—is, and has always been, the treatment of the individual as well as of his disease. No physician need hope for success who does not bear this ancient and elementary aphorism in mind, and indeed it is not so original as Mr. Dawson appears to think. Its popularity with the public is perhaps more recent, and few distinguished laymen when addressing a gathering of medical students fail to justify their hearers' worst fears by repeating it. In the layman's mind it has a peculiar quality of freshness that the doctor may be pardoned for failing to notice.

The opening chapters of the book deal in a popular fashion with the ancient cults of healing among Assyrians, Babylonians, Greeks and Romans. The theurgic and the Hippocratic schools each receives mention, and the writer then proceeds to discuss the healing activities of our Lord. His interpretation of these events is not such as any Catholic—some would say any Christian—can hold, and it is couched in the terminology of that chaos of conflicting speculations euphemistically known as "the new psychology." The raising of Jairus' daughter is considered under the heading of telepathy and suggestion. Our Lord's analysis of the sufferers He healed was, we are told, "immediate, intuitive and complete. He did not need to probe the sub-conscious mind by the elaborate methods of psycho-analysis." Cures "at a distance," such as that of the centurion's servant, are explained by supposing that the centurion was in telepathic rapport with his servant. For the healing of the ear of the servant of Malchus, modern psychology fails to provide a solution and hence for the author this cure remains "an enigma." In conclusion, it is submitted that Christ's knowledge of psychological laws transcended our most inspired dreams, and His healings are not miraculous in "the traditional sense of being violations of law." But surely, the traditional sense of the word "miracle" involves no violation of law, but rather a transcending or supersession of natural law.

In his chapters dealing with modern mental and spiritual healing the author falls into the common error of the layman (medically considered) of ignoring the essential distinction between mentally and physically determined illness: that is, between bodily symptoms and disabilities produced in the normal body by disordered action of the mind, and the symptoms and disabilities resulting from structural disease and injury. No useful consideration of healing is possible that does not recognize this distinction, that fails to appreciate the vast mass of

mentally-determined illness by which we are surrounded, or that does not emphasize that even physically determined illness may have a heavy "top-dressing" of psychologically produced disability. Everyone is aware of the emotional reaction that may so gravely increase the disability produced by some physical injury. No one familiar with the fruits of the Workmen's Compensation Act can fail to be painfully aware of it, but it is not here alone that neurosis overlies physical abnormality.

In the final chapters, the author attempts a summary of Freudian psychology, in the therapeutic efficacy of which he has absolute confidence, assuming that every psycho-analysis ends in the cure of the patient.

Would that this were so! But, of course, the assumption is remote from the facts of experience. It would be fruitless to discuss the author's acceptance of Freudian doctrines, or his faith in their scientific quality, for his uncritical attitude in this respect is but the reflection of his necessary inability to assess any of the phenomena of healing, or any of its literature.

It is ironical that this book should be published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. To the Catholic the author's views on the healing miracles of our Lord are not Christian, while for the doctor the medical portions of the book are not knowledge.

F. M. R. WALSHE.

Schools of Kildare and Leighlin A.D. 1775-1835. By Rev. Martin Brenan, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin, 1935. 616 pages, large Octavo. 10s. net.)

Compiled by a young Maynooth professor, this substantial work is a valuable as well as a surprising contribution to the history of Catholic education in Ireland, during a period that opens under the grim shadow of the Penal Laws, and closes with the dawn of Catholic Emancipation. As a record of Catholic Action under adverse circumstances, the story told in these fascinating pages is probably unique. It can be affirmed without exaggeration that in no other country in modern times has the Catholic Body, when politically impotent and socially outcast, so triumphantly vindicated the right of Catholic parents to give a Catholic education to their children. The obstacles were tremendous: the proselytizing activity of the State church, with its vast financial backing, the local influence and interference of landlordism, the hostility of the magistracy, the pressure of the Penal Laws—all these were courageously confronted and overcome by bishops, priests, parents and teachers.

The sources that Dr. Brenan makes use of, many of them now uncovered for the first time, are indeed a revelation. The amazing success of the Christian Doctrine Confraternity, for example, provides unexpected reading.

The major portion of this striking book is concerned with the story of popular education in the diocese of Kildare and

Leighlin, during the period indicated. In 1824, the parish priests of this diocese furnished their bishop, Dr. Doyle, with a detailed report on the schools, teachers, and scholars, etc., in their respective parishes. These reports Dr. Brennan now prints for the first time, supplementing them with extracts from Government Blue Books. They build up a complete picture of the state of Catholic education in the whole or part of seven Irish counties. The book is printed in excellent type on good paper, and the price is reasonable.

J. R. MEAGHER.

Gentle Ireland. By Hugh de Blacam. (Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee; Geo. E. J. Coldwell, London. 2 dollars.)

Whether you like Ireland or not, you will like this book. All you need is a little sympathy with simple life, and with strong, simple people whose life is chiefly in the fields and whose fields are seldom far from a Catholic church. A little sympathy will suffice; the book will give you more. It will give you also some choice translations of genuine Irish poetry, samples of Irish folklore, sketches of Saints and heroes from Colmcille to Matt Talbot, snatches of Irish song and fragments of Irish history—these last set down not with bitterness, but with a prayer of thanks that “the Gael and his faith are still there, by the grace of God.” Written with knowledge, sympathy, and understanding, and with rare literary craft, Mr. de Blacam’s book is a pleasing and valuable picture of Catholicism in every-day life. It deserves a wide sale.

B. P.

Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne are to be congratulated on the continued excellence of their two invaluable year-books, *The Catholic Directory* (3s. 6d.) and *The Catholic Who’s Who* (5s.). The *Directory* has obviously done its best to be absolutely up to date for its page xi. contains “latest changes and corrections” and page 72b gives a list of the nominations to the Papal College for the consistory which has just taken place. The *Who’s Who* contains a five-page preface by the Archbishop of Liverpool in which His Grace gives an interesting account of his visit to Australia and a report of progress made in the building of the new Metropolitan Cathedral.

T. E. F.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

The first article in fascicule IV (1835) of GREGORIANUM is a sympathetic study by Fr. Boyer, S.J., of the ideas of *M. Maurice Blondel*. Whilst admitting the difficulty of rightly understanding his thought, his interpretation of the traditional proofs for God's existence, and his views on the question of the natural desire of seeing God, are explained. Blondel's position is subjected to criticism but the real value of his thought is recognized. Fr. Walsh, S.J., writes in English on *The Doctrine of St. Thomas in the "Convivio" of Dante*. The recent commentary by Fr. John Busnelli is cited throughout the article and many doubts are resolved. In the same number F. Pelster, S.J., continues his examination of the *Translation of Aristotle used by St. Thomas*.

RECHERCHES DES SCIENCES RELIGIEUSES (Numéro 5, 1935) contains, in addition to the final article by Dr. H. du Manoir on the *Patristic Arguments in the Nestorian Controversy*, two useful historical Bulletins, the one on Christian Origins, the other on modern Church History.

ETUDES FRANCISCAINES (December, 1935) is chiefly concerned with historical research into questions of Franciscan interest. But there is a good missionary article by Père Damien entitled *Le Christ chez les Hindous*, in which full use is made of the report written in 1933 by the Apostolic Delegate in India, Mgr. Kierkels. Père Romuald writes some useful notes on the doctrine of the *Mystical Body of Christ* as set out in Père Mura's recent study of the subject.

NOUVELLE REVUE THÉOLOGIQUE for December, 1935, continues its policy of debating the living questions of the day. Dr. Kothen surveys the results of *Ten years of the Jocist movement*, with reference to the International Congress held in August of this year. Fr. Hayen, S.J., deals with the same subject from the point of view of *Catholic Action*. He rightly considers the movement, in its essential structure, to be an excellent expression of what is meant by Catholic Action. Fr. Levie, S.J., in an article entitled *Le Saint Siège et les Conflits Internationaux*, with the aid chiefly of notes taken from *Osservatore Romano*, groups together the pronouncements of the Pope bearing upon the Italo-Ethiopian conflict. Fr. de Coninck, S.J., in a second contribution, *Cognosco Oves Meas*, discusses the necessity of keeping a parochial census, though he is well alive to the enormous labour and difficulty involved in this work, particularly in town parishes.

ENSEIGNEMENT CHRÉTIEN, a review devoted to secondary education, contains, amongst many contributions of educational interest, an informative account of the subject in the United

States by Dr. M. Blouin. It is three hundred years since the first secondary school in America was founded, "The Latin Grammar School" at Boston, and this foundation became the model for its successors. The problems at the moment turn on three issues: the economic crisis, the lack of suitable positions for those who have finished their education, and the demand for supplementary instruction on the part of those unable to pay the ordinary college fees.

A new periodical devoted to the Orthodox Churches, *THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*, aims at carrying out the wishes of the Holy Father expressed in his letter "*Rerum Orientalium*," by helping Catholics of the West to understand the Christian traditions of the East. This will prepare the way for the Reunion of the dissident Eastern Churches. The first number (January, 1936) gives us a translation of an article by Dr. Francis Grivec, a professor of the University of Ljubljana, on *The Church the Body of Christ and the Conciliar Idea*. He shows that Oriental theologians implicitly link the synodal form of Church government with the idea of the Mystical Body of Christ, some regarding the synodal régime as an essential attribute of the Church, others even stressing the collective character of the Church almost to the exclusion of its hierarchical constitution.

We heartily welcome what is, in some respects, a new feature in the excellent *DOCUMENTATION CATHOLIQUE*. The editors give, from time to time, documentary evidence concerning the actual doctrinal condition of the Church of England which will help to dispel the illusion, very common in France, that the Established Church is Catholic in all but a few points of doctrine and discipline. The account given in December, for example, of the Modernist movement will be a useful corrective.

CHRISTUS, an attractive little Review, chiefly of ascetical interest, contains in the December number an enquiry by Dr. Charles Quenet into *The mystical element in the spiritual life of the Curé d'Ars*. It is possible, indeed, to see in his life an example of the "extraordinary" ways of God, as in some other saints; but it appears more likely that his prayer of contemplation was the "ordinary" kind. Dr. A. Chagny writes on the early *Martyrs of Lyons* and M. Pignal on *Le Sionisme Palestinien et son attitude religieuse*.

The most generally useful pages of the current *COLLATIONES NAMURCENSES* (January, 1936) are those which contain the solutions of the diocesan cases. There is an excellent presentation of the teaching of the moral theologians on the problems of "Courting," the Latin for which is *De Procreationibus seu visitationibus amatoriiis*. The thesis is, of course, that it is lawful with certain provisions, namely: "dummodo: (1) In eis, directe non quaeratur vel deliberate non admittatur delectatio venerea. (2) In manifestatione mutui amoris omnis actus excludatur qui de se tendat ad carnalem commotionem excit-

andam. (3) Et debitae adhibeantur cautela ad omnem peccandi occasionem removendum." Practical notes of a similar character are found in the January COLLECTANEA MECHLINENSIA. Dr. Van Hove explains the law to be observed in *Carrying the Holy Eucharist privately to the sick*. Dr. Mesmaecker discusses the *Scrupulous Conscience*.

APOLLINARIS (n. 3, 1935), in addition to the usual reprint of Roman Documents with commentary, gives us a study by Dr. Ciprotti *De consummatione delictorum attento eorum elemento objectifo*. Dr. Wasner writes on the procedure to be observed at *The enthronement and coronation of the Popes*. Among the Consultations, which are a prominent feature of this journal, we have an explanation of *Legal Adoption* (Canons 1059, 1080) and of the rules which forbids the acceptance of a stipend when duplicating (Canon 824, §2).

E. J. M.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. KING GEORGE V.

Throughout the Country and the Empire as we go to press there is a sense of personal bereavement. We are at one with the millions of our fellow-subjects in mourning a King who enjoyed not only the respect and loyalty due to his high office, but also an admiration and, still more, an affection earned by his personal character and conduct. A sailor, King George V had the courage, sincerity, modesty, the devotion to duty, the love of home, the delight in simple pleasures, the sympathy with his fellow-men which we are used to associate with the following of the sea. His subjects trusted him and were proud of him.

Together with his Royal Consort, to whom all hearts have gone out in sympathy in this hour of grief, he gave an example of the sacredness of family life and love of the domestic hearth in a period when frivolity and insincerity gravely threatened these fundamental values. He was ever conscious of the plight of those who suffered from the world depression and did what he could to alleviate their lot. From the very beginning of his reign he manifested a strong faith in God and a dependence on the divine aid at a time when so many have lost any real grasp on the eternal realities. For all this we are grateful to God.

And now while offering our loyal homage to our new Sovereign, King Edward VIII, we beg for His Majesty a continuance of that divine guidance and support on which his Royal Father so confidently and confessedly relied.

II. FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt.

With M. Laval's resignation a curious situation gives endless scope for political manœuvre. Everybody agrees that the general tendency is towards the Left as the elections approach, and that both the Communists and the Socialists will gain many seats. The financial crisis is so acute that any Government which is in office before the elections will be blamed for its consequences. The one reason for remaining in office is that the existing Government can always "make the elections" to a large extent. Laval exercised vast power of patronage and political influence, and each week that passed reduced the danger that his influence could be undone before the election takes place. But in the meantime he and his colleagues gain prestige for having had the courage to remain at their posts and for having been treated as indispensable for so long. Also they can claim that

they have kept France from being dragged into war with Italy, and have led Europe in seeking for a peaceful solution at Geneva when other countries, particularly Great Britain, were urging provocative measures.

A further complication is the apparent divergence of views among the leaders of the Left concerning France's future foreign policy. The main conflict between Laval and Herriot has been that Laval wished to retain Italy's friendship at all costs, while Herriot was prepared to side strongly with England against Italy. Herriot has been no less strongly pro-Russian, and his programme has been roughly a return to the conditions prior to 1914, when England, France and Russia encircled Germany. The Communists are naturally pro-Russian also, but M. Laval has established a surprising affinity of hopes with M. Daladier in his desire for a *rapprochement* with Germany. Daladier had been the ablest young leader of the Left generally, until he was discredited by the Stavisky riots of two years ago; and he has since thrown in his lot openly with the militant Socialists who have been organizing against the Croix de Feu and the Fascist Leagues. Last summer, when both sides paraded their massed processions at opposite ends of Paris, Daladier appeared on a taxi-cab in the Place de la Nation, giving the Communist salute to the endless procession of Socialists and Communists who marched past. But Daladier's personal views on foreign politics favour an attempt at *rapprochement* with Germany on lines rather similar to the policy of Laval; and it is impossible to say how such a policy is to be reconciled with the fundamentally anti-German attitude of all true disciples of revolutionary Russia. It may be that a Left wing Government in France will aim at fostering Socialist discontent in Germany; but such a programme is not likely to promote any understanding between Nazi Germany and France. Meanwhile Laval continues to procrastinate about ratifying the Franco-Russian treaty which would virtually commit France to immediate military action against Germany if Hitler undertook any adventure involving Russia on his eastern frontier.

The programme issued by the Front Populaire at this stage shows a surprising moderation. Its principal points concern social and economic questions, and the old anti-religious cries have so far been discreetly suppressed. They include demands for a shorter working week without reduction of wages; continuation of the school age to 14; the encouragement of younger workers by provision of retiring pensions for the old; stricter control of banks and limited liability companies; nationalization of the Bank of France; and control of the export of capital, with penalties for evasion amounting to confiscation of funds concealed abroad or of their equivalent in France. Another item is the demand for the suppression of private armament factories. The whole programme expresses the widespread discontent and unrest of a country which has suffered for years from deflation and the maintenance of the gold standard when

other countries have abandoned it. On those grounds, and on the general reaction against the activities of the Fascist League, the various parties of the Left still hope that they will sweep the country in April.

Cardinal Verdier of Paris has made several noteworthy pronouncements during the past month. His Christmas message was largely concerned with the Church's influence in international affairs, and the opportunities for promoting better relations through international congresses in Paris and elsewhere. He drew attention particularly to the plans of the Bishop of Lourdes for yet another pilgrimage of ex-combatants from all nations, which is expected to assemble 200,000 ex-soldiers at Lourdes. In another address Cardinal Verdier dealt with the duties of the clergy in social questions. He pointed out that thousands of families, afflicted by unemployment, had grown utterly dissatisfied with a social system which leaves them no opportunity to earn a living, and are convinced that a system which does not provide a livelihood must inevitably collapse. He urged that the only remedy for such discontent was that Catholics, and the clergy especially, should win the confidence of the working class and convince them of the spiritual values of life. "The great problem of the moment," he declared, "is to concentrate on Sunday, to make religion interesting, and preaching practical. We must make known the social and political teaching of the Church, particularly among those who hate us and only know us through distorting glasses."

Mgr. Feltin, who has been appointed Archbishop of Bordeaux in succession to the late Cardinal Andrieu, is a very striking instance of how a younger generation is gradually filling the chief positions in the Church. Cardinal Andrieu was born in 1849; and having been made a Cardinal when he was Bishop of Marseilles in 1907, he was second in seniority on the whole list of Cardinals when he died. His new successor, Mgr. Feltin, was born in 1883 and was ordained in 1909. He had been only for a few years a junior curate in the archdiocese of Besançon when his work was interrupted by the Great War, and he went to the front immediately as a stretcher bearer. He was four times mentioned in dispatches and was awarded both the military medal and the Legion of Honour for war service. He returned to his diocese and in 1925 became an honorary canon. Two years later he was nominated Bishop of Troyes and became the youngest bishop in France. Actually Cardinal Liénart of Lille is a year younger, but he did not become a bishop until soon afterwards; and when Mgr. Feltin was translated to Sens in 1932 as its archbishop he became France's youngest archbishop. His magnificent zeal and organizing powers have now led to his further promotion; and as archbishop of Bordeaux he becomes Primate of Aquitaine. In each diocese he has shown a remarkable capacity for establishing personal relations with his flock and he has been one of the most

energetic pioneers of Catholic Action. In his few years at Sens he succeeded also in completing the major Seminary by prodigious efforts and appeals.

III. CENTRAL EUROPE.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

GERMANY.

In a previous issue of the CLERGY REVIEW, I referred to the various neo-pagan movements in Germany, which receive encouragement from the National-Socialist régime. I am now able to give more detail in the form of some extracts from the book *Wo is Gott*, by Count Reventlow who is associated with Professor Hauer, the leader of the German Faith Movement. For more detailed information I would refer my readers to the "Friends of Europe" publications, which recently devoted considerable space to the subject.

Count Reventlow, unlike the other leaders of the various neo-pagan movements, is not a figure who came into prominence as a result of the Nazi upheaval. He was a well-known Nationalist leader long before Nazism. Far from being a mere tool of the present régime, his independence of attitude has more than once brought him into conflict with the present rulers of Germany. Nevertheless, he endeavours to express his own ideas in terms of the present German political doctrine (i.e., Nazism).

The ideas he expresses are in direct conflict with Catholic thought. Therefore, they must be taken seriously for purposes of refutation. Otherwise they might almost be regarded as ludicrous; a string of absurdities solemnly enumerated.

Count Reventlow's book does not answer the question of its title. It does not tell the reader where God is; but only where, in the author's view, He is not. According to Count Reventlow, one of the places where God is not to be found is the Catholic Church.

In his foreword he writes:—

"The question: 'Where is God?' was never more seriously and urgently asked, and not for centuries to the same extent.

"Millions of Germans ask: 'Where is God?' who feel themselves in a religious sense without a home, who wander hungry in the desert of Materialism, Rationalism, and a Christianity grim and fantastic in its garb of sects, dogmas, symbols and cults."

Turning to the question of Christianity, Count Reventlow says:—

"If the Church is to be really a people's Church, it must become the support of the religious German 'Volksgemeinschaft.' The primary condition underlying everything is that

the 'Volk' in its religious being must occupy precisely the same place as the Church with its dogmas and priesthood."

The Christian Church, he continues, holds its power over the German people by playing on fear :

"But fear did not make the German gods and God. On the contrary, it is the God of the Church and its supporters who have made fear. . . . The idea of the Church, however, is in Germany in dissolution."

With regard to our Blessed Lord, Count Reventlow rather ingeniously tries to get round the Jewish problem by asserting that Jesus was psychologically not a Jew. He says :

"We honour the personality of Jesus, doch ohn' Verlangen. He is not, however, the leader of our souls, or the desire of our minds. He is not the 'Saviour' without whom we are lost, condemned and subject to 'death.'"

But do not mistake the character of this tolerance :

"Not only turning away from Christianity, but its outspoken rejection is the essence of the first stage of the religious ferment in Germany. This rejection must not be described as a negation. It is the product of a religious passion and a need which Christianity cannot satisfy nor justify. It is a genuine and purely natural development."

Count Reventlow's conclusion is as follows :—

"Wouldst thou know where God is, I can only answer from the watchtower of my consciousness which, let us hope, is a little more enhancible than it was : 'I know that I know nothing.'"

"I do not know, however, that the question 'Where?' is not a question alone, but as such has the power to lead us upwards and in itself is the value of life. This remains true as long as the question lasts—the question and the tension. Demandest thou an answer to 'Where is God?' Look ever upwards—this direction can never deceive. The direction and the power which directs, is 'Eros,' is 'Alles.' Insatiability for the higher inspiration leads through all guilt and error to the only certain trace of God there is for us, ever above and beyond itself."

"Immer über dich hinaus! (Soar above yourself). But never beyond Germany and the possible boundaries of the German Reich—never beyond the German soul!"

AUSTRIA.

I have frequently had occasion to cite in these columns the *Christliche Standestaat*, the Catholic Austrian journal, and particularly the articles of Professor Wilhelm Böhn. In a recent article he advances an extremely interesting argument in favour of the preservation of an independent Catholic Austria.

He is particularly anxious to refute the view of those

Austrians who, without being Nazis, are Pan-Germans, and who hold that while an independent Austria is necessary so long as the Nazi régime lasts in Germany, the reason for that independence would cease to exist once Nazism came to an end in Germany.

Nationalism, writes Professor Böhn, sees only the Nation in the building up of the State; and demands the union of the nation and the State, without excluding, for geographical reasons, minorities which speak a different tongue. But uniform nationalism, he continues, can only exist in a nomad State arising out of the clan. Once a people settles down, it comes into contact with neighbouring peoples, and thus it is the State which creates the people and not the people the State. Without regard to language, States are formed either by personalities or circumstances. It is the State which creates uniformity in culture and in language.

The English and French States, continues Professor Böhn, preceded the English and French languages. The so-called German nation exists only on one level of educated people. Otherwise it is only a number of Germanic tribes, many of which are more dissimilar than are the various Scandinavian peoples living in their separate kingdoms.

There is no valid reason for Germany to make claims to Austria on grounds of language or nation. No other country makes claims to other countries on such grounds.

Austria, admittedly, shares with Germany an old relationship of language and culture within the Central European area—this Central European enclosure which has brought the various Germanic tribes into relationship. But the Austrians are a special people—the result of the fusion of many influences, Germanic, Latin, Byzantine and Alpine.

It was the Austrian people which, down the ages, fought for the Empire, for Central Europe, from the Baltic to the Carpathians.

It was not Austria which separated from Germany, Professor Böhn declares, but Germany which separated from Austria.

Germany, instead of co-operating, indulged in sabotage, spiritually at the time of the Reformation, and politically since 1850.

When Germany separated from Austria, the latter had to concentrate on the Danube. Berlin cannot understand the questions of Hungary and the Balkans. Vienna is the natural focus. It is this focus that Berlin wants to destroy.

The modern German's conception of the State as the highest form of existence is a Protestant idea. Austria is Catholic. This explains the great difference between the two neighbours.

In conclusion, Professor Böhn asserts that the only terms upon which Austria could agree to union with Germany, would be "a liquidation of 1866," and as Germany—Prusso-Germany—is

not likely to agree to anything of the kind, the independence of Austria must be maintained, whatever the régime in the German Reich.

Herr von Schuschnigg, the Austrian Chancellor, at a recent meeting, addressed the leaders of the Catholic Youth Organizations.

The Chancellor impressed upon the Catholic Youth leaders that organization must not become an end in itself. For such implied the danger of losing sight of ultimate aims.

"None of us," said Herr von Schuschnigg, "has the right to apply to himself alone the title of patriot." Not everybody who is patriotic, he continued, is within the Patriotic Front. No one has the exclusive right to patriotism; but everybody has the duty to be patriotic.

Having abolished party organizations, the spirit of such organizations must not be transferred to the patriotic Catholic Youth Movement. We must see a possible brother in everyone, and look beyond the confines of the organization.

"We are all supported," the Chancellor declared, "by faith. And we have the passionate conviction that no one can serve the patriotic idea better than those who have the Catholic Faith."

CORRESPONDENCE

DOM HUGH BÉVENOT, O.S.B., B.A.

Dr. T. E. Bird writes:—

By the death of Dom Hugh Bévenot the Church in England has lost one who gave fair promise of becoming her leading exponent of biblical study. The son of Professor Bévenot of the Birmingham University, Hugh graduated at the same University and afterwards joined the Benedictine community at Erdington. Strange that this ardent biblical scholar could write in later years: "When I entered the monastery all that I knew about the Old Testament could be written on half a sheet of note-paper—except that I had read Racine's play *Athalie*!" He was professed in 1914 and began his theological studies two years later. Students at Oscott at the close of the Great War will remember the young Benedictine who limped into the Northcote Hall (he was afflicted with lameness) and quietly took his place daily in the back row to follow the lectures in Dogma, Moral, and Sacred Scripture. His modesty was known to all, and the professors were not slow in recognizing his ability, in spite of the fact that his examination papers did small justice to his polished mind, for his affliction made rapid writing impossible, with the result that perhaps half the questions were unanswered.

Hugh was ordained in 1920 and preached his first sermons

in the little chapel of St. Nicholas built by Cardinal Wiseman at Boldmere. Then came the departure of the German fathers from Erdington to Weingarten, a result of the War; and with loyalty to his community the young priest left his native land. It was at Weingarten that Fr. Hugh completed his first book, *Pagan and Christian Rule*, published by Longmans, in the preface of which he acknowledged his indebtedness to Mgr. Henry Parkinson, first President of the Catholic Social Guild, who "directed my attention to valuable books in the Oscott library on Christian social work during the early Christian period and in the Middle Ages, and took a kind interest in my study." In a letter to the present writer he gave the object of the book: "My purpose was to give young Catholics when finishing their education something definite to *know* and to *say* about what the Church stood and stands for. I spent a lot of trouble to get the historical details accurate."

The year after the book was published (1925) his beloved and much respected father died. Dom Hugh writes: "I had a very painful interruption of my life here in February. My dear father fell seriously ill at Torquay and I was wired. Unfortunately, I could only get there on Sunday, February 23rd, while father had breathed his last on the Saturday morning. You can understand what a blow it was. The end was quite peaceful, and father was well prepared. Archbishop McIntyre kindly made the effort to come and see him on the Friday and gave him his blessing. I said the Requiem and took the funeral. Fortunately, it is but once in a lifetime. R.I.P."

Social science did not retain its hold. Since his student days Dom Hugh had found special delight in the pages of Sacred Scripture, and it was to this subject that, with the approval of his superiors, he now devoted all his attention. On his way back to Weingarten after his father's funeral he spent two days at the British Museum, then four days in Paris "where I had easy access to the libraries, and made the most of the Louvre." Back at Weingarten the whole of his time, not devoted to community duties, was spent in writing reviews and articles on Old and New Testament studies for a variety of Scriptural periodicals. Already in 1924 he had written an article on *Prolegomena to Machabees* for "Bibliotheca Sacra," the first indication of the particular field in which he had decided to work. He came to England again in 1928 and after visiting his Benedictine brother at Ampleforth and his Jesuit brother at Heythrop he hurried to the British Museum library. "I just about covered essentials there in three days, coming across some good plums for my *Machabees*." Twice within the next two years he was at Munich where he "found splendid things in the library" for the commentary now nearing completion. Towards the close of 1930 *Die Beiden Makkabäerbücher* was published by Hanstein. It is certainly remarkable that this young English priest who had resided in Germany but a few years should have contributed a splendid volume of 250 pages

to the now famous "Bonner Bibel." The reviewers in various European periodicals welcomed the work with enthusiasm; nor was it neglected by non-Catholic English reviews as *Theology*, *Expository Times*, etc. As soon as the German commentary was off his hands Dom Hugh began the preparation of a larger work in English; but I cannot say whether he completed it before his death.

Dom Hugh was of French extraction, but his father became a naturalized Englishman many years before Hugh was born. The son was very tenacious of his English birthright. Writing in April, 1931, he remarked: "Our Congregation will be glad enough one day to have an Englishman to send to the 'Dormitio' on Sion," and he ardently hoped that the choice would fall on him. His wish was realized two years later. In March, 1933, he left Weingarten, and after a fortnight in Rome, where he had an audience with the Holy Father and "did a little research work in the Vatican library," he reached Jerusalem in the April. At the Dormition Abbey he rejoiced to find that the régime "was much more English than at Weingarten." He was soon at the library of the Biblical Institute and began to add to his knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German and Italian the study of Arabic and Syriac. He attended lectures given by Père Abel, Père Barrois and Père Savignac, and spent what time he could afford in exploring biblical sites.

From its inception he was an enthusiastic admirer of the CLERGY REVIEW, and looked forward to his monthly copy with pleasure. He thought that it was just the thing that the secular clergy in England required. He submitted one article on *Habacuc* and was not too disappointed when it was declined because of its highly technical character. In the last year of his life he prepared *Nahum* and *Habacuc* for the *Westminster Version* which, fortunately, were completed before his death.

His last letters written at Christmas speak of his sadness at the departure of the illustrious scholar Père Lagrange from Jerusalem to France on medical advice, and of his own intention of celebrating his three Christmas Masses at Bethlehem. He was forty-four years of age when death came upon him on January 2nd. Of the beauty of his personal character we have not space to speak: it may be summed up in the words "Pax Benedictina." May his sweet soul rest in everlasting peace.

USURY, THE WORD AND THE THING.

Father Drinkwater writes:—

Fr. Lewis Watt, in the course of a kind notice of a book of mine (see CLERGY REVIEW for January), says: "I find some difficulty in understanding exactly what Father Drinkwater condemns as usury. It is to be hoped that he will publish a longer and more systematic account of the intricacies of modern

finance, pointing out just where they fall under the condemnation of usury."

First let me say, that does not seem to be my job. Are there no Catholic moral theologians or economic experts to be found in the same country as the Bank of England? After all, I am only a parish priest who (after looking in vain to the specialists during all his lifetime) is raising an unseemly clamour because it seems absolutely necessary for someone to do so. Anyone who thinks I take any interest in this subject for its own sake, or that I would keep up the noise a moment longer than may be necessary to awaken the properly-qualified watch-dogs, is mistaken.

Besides, the assembling of the facts for judgment on modern finance is already being done effectively by non-Catholic writers, notably by Mr. Jeffery Mark, whose latest book I hope Fr. Lewis Watt will be able to describe in his next notes.

Meanwhile, to keep the interest of the clergy alive, I will briefly fulfil part of Fr. Watt's request and say what I mean by usury. I always use this word—in what seems to me its traditional Catholic sense, as well as its traditional use in English literature—to mean any kind of injustice arising out of the practice of money-lending.

In mediæval times the essence of the sin of usury was apparently thought to lie in the lending of money for profit without risk. I think that would be a pretty good test of what to-day is or is not anti-social (likely to have unjust effects) in the lending of actual money (e.g., of savings). Of the purely moral theology aspect—i.e., what exactly a confessor can allow his penitents to do in England in 1936—I am not speaking at all. That is for the moral theologians to settle, and naturally they will go to hell, along with their clients, if they are too lenient, for "lenience" to usurers evidently amounts to taking a share in the oppression of the poor.

Will the reader please note that I said "the lending of money for profit without risk." Not necessarily for interest. Interest is not necessarily usury, nor is usury necessarily interest.

For instance, I lend you £2,000 on the security of your farm, which is worth £2,000 and a lot more. Owing to poverty you fail to pay me any interest, and I do not pester you for it; but sooner or later the time comes when you must repay my £2,000, and you cannot; then your farm falls into my possession, as I knew all along it would.

Such a transaction is usury, or something equally bad; all the more if I have controlled the market-price of farm products, and the purchasing-power of your neighbours, in such a way as to ensure that your farm would not pay its way.

Bank-loans to industry or agriculture are usurious sometimes because they are of the character described in the previous paragraph. But they are practically always usurious (it seems

to me) on another count—namely, when the lender is running no risk at all, because all the while he is not lending money but only a substitute for money—bank-credit—which he creates himself at will, and at practically no cost. If an over-draft becomes a bad debt the bank has *lost* nothing, except I suppose the opportunity of granting somebody else an equivalent over-draft of equally imaginary money. Similarly, when a bank seizes the security for an overdraft, it is all sheer gain (except for the trivial expenses of book-keeping).

If you like to say, however, that credit-creation in private hands does not involve usury but theft (of the community's credit), I do not suppose I should quarrel with you.

Because of the development of credit-creation as a monopoly in private hands, modern usury is infinitely worse in its effects than anything contemplated by St. Thomas Aquinas, or his commentators of to-day, who still seem to think of money as metallic.

Credit-creation has enabled the usurers to preside over the whole money-supply from source to ending. Their opportunities are unlimited in variety; every kind of moneylender and financial middleman is making the most of them all the time, and the sufferers, of course, are those who have no way of getting money except by working. There is no real need for moral theology to follow out all the intricacies of modern finance, any more than it needs to follow out the various ways of committing murder by poisoning, stabbing, strangling, etc.

Having done my best to provide a brief answer to Fr. Lewis Watt's request, I think I am entitled to put a question to him myself. Has he yet satisfied himself that the banking-system has the power of creating and destroying purchasing-power? If he has, I think he should be able himself to trace many of the operations of what I call usury. If he has not—but I cannot bring myself to consider such an alternative.

g
y
es
tt
e
r
k
ot

e
s

y
s
is
s

e
es
al
e
y
o
it
y

s
n
n
?
f
t

=
=



THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XIV. No. 1. *The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, SS. Comas and Damian* January, 1936.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AND ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE GUILD.

EDITORIAL.—The Hierarchy and the Guild. Medical Aid for the Missions. Voluntary Euthanasia. Lambeth Degrees in Medicine.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—The Canons Regular of St. Augustine and the Hospital of St. Bartholomew, by Abbot A. Smith, C.R.L., D.D. Psychotherapy by Dr. E. B. Strauss. Spiritual Healing by the Archbishop of Liverpool. More about Dichotomy, by Dr. M. Kyndt.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AT VIENNA, WHITSUNTIDE, 1936.

REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTICES.—Ethics of Ectopic Operations, by Fr. Lionel Bouscaren, S.J. The Missionary Medical Manual (India), by Major

C. S. P. Hamilton, D.S.O. Précis de Médecine Catholique, by Dr. Henry Bon. New Maryland, by Fr. Vincent Baker, Cong.-Orat. Food Values at a Glance, by Violet Plimmer.

Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London, 43, 44, 46, Newgate Street, E.C.1.

NOTE.—EDITOR'S ADDRESS:

Heathwood, Bushey Heath, Herts. Telephone: Bushey Heath 1405.

ADVERTISEMENT MANAGER:

5, Racquet Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4. Telephone: Central 6806.

Price: 1s. 4d. Annual Subscription, 5s. (Post free). United States, \$1.50.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES, AND CHARCOAL for use with INCENSE OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6227

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON

THE BREAKESPEARE CLUB.

KENSINGTON PALACE MANSIONS, DE VERE GARDENS, LONDON, W.8. (overlooking Kennington Gardens). Telephone, Western 8485. The new Catholic Social Club. Reading and writing rooms. Bedrooms (reduced rates for members 5s. a night with bath, up to 3 nights).

Entrance fee, 21 1s. Annual subscription, 23 3s. (Half-yearly rate for those joining now).

For further particulars apply to Hon. Secretary.



**chalices
OSBORNE**
117, GOWER ST.
LONDON, W.C.1.
SEND FOR BOOK 16

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 43 Newhall-Hill
Donald B. Tansley Birmingham &
John Hardman Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
& Co. Limited Church Decoration St. Pancras
Private Compy. London, W.1

GERALD J. HARDMAN,

5a, Temple-row, BIRMINGHAM.

Telephone: Central 3753.

All kinds of Church Furniture, Metal Work, Carving in Wood and Stone, Renovations. Gilding, &c.

CHURCH BUILDINGS IN NEW HOUSING AREAS

HARBROW'S

TEMPORARY AND SEMI-PERMANENT BUILDINGS AFFORD DURABLE, EFFICIENT, ECONOMICAL AND EXPEDITIOUS MEANS OF MEETING ALL REQUIREMENTS.

ESTD. 50 YEARS.



Semi-permanent Church.

Write for Suggestions, Estimates and Drawings. Dept. U.

WILLIAM HARBROW, Ltd.

**SOUTH BERMONDSEY,
LONDON — S.E.16**

NEW PUBLICATIONS

SAINTS YOU OUGHT TO KNOW

By G. J. MacGILLIVRAY, M.A.

This excellent handbook provides in a convenient and very readable form the information that everybody desires to have about the lives of a number of Saints whose names are most widely known.

Cloth 5/-

A SHORT LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI

By St. BONAVENTURE.

Adapted by ANNE PRITCHARD.

This little book, which gives in a brief and convenient form all the main incidents in the life of St. Francis, as written by St. Bonaventure, will prove of particular use and interest to Tertiaries.

Cloth 2/6

HAWLEY STREAM

By F. M. HARRISON.

A historical novel which describes with rare dramatic power the betrayal of a Catholic landowner to the pursuivants in the reigns of James I and Charles I.

Cloth 7/6

THE LABOUR CONTRACT

By Professor B. F. SHIELDS.

Examines the present condition of the relations between employers and workers in the light of the principles of social justice set forth in the teaching of Pope Leo XIII.

Cloth 5/-

THE SACRED HEART AND THE EUCHARIST

By BERNARD WELZEL, S.J.

This little book of meditations is largely concerned with ingratitude regarding the Blessed Eucharist. Miss Isabel Garahan has provided an excellent translation.

Cloth 1/6

Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,
43 44 45 Newgate St., E.C.1 and 129 Victoria St., S.W.1
AND AT
MANCHESTER - GLASGOW - BIRMINGHAM - DUBLIN

Printed in Great Britain by Gibbs & Bamforth Ltd., St. Albans, Herts.

